

American Sentinel, vol. 2

ESR

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1887	3
January 1887	3
"Both Sides" American Sentinel 2, 1.	3
CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION	5
ARTICLE I	6
ARTICLE II	6
February 1887	15
"The Legacy from Our Fathers" American Sentinel 2, 2.	15
March 1887	21
"A Substitute for the Church" American Sentinel 2, 3.	21
"Ethics of Sunday Legislation" American Sentinel 2, 3.	23
May 1887	29
"National Reform Principles Despotism" American Sentinel 2, 5.	29
"Personal Liberty" American Sentinel 2, 5.	30
THE RIGHT TO REST	32
THE RIGHT OF CONSCIENCE	33
July 1887	36
"A Little Comparison" American Sentinel 2, 5.	36
August 1887	39
"Convicted on Their Own Testimony" American Sentinel 2, 8.	39
September 1887	47
"A 'Virtual Theocracy' Promised" American Sentinel 2, 9.	47
"Church and State" American Sentinel 2, 9.	48
October 1887	58
"Not 'A Daniel Come to Judgment'" American Sentinel 2, 10.	58
November 1887	64
"The Bible in the Public Schools" American Sentinel 2, 11.	64
December 1887	69
"An Examine of Principles" American Sentinel 2, 12.	69

1887

January 1887

“Both Sides” American Sentinel 2, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

From the Rev. Robert White, of Steubenville, Ohio, we have the following communications under the heading, “Hear the Other Side,” which in harmony with his request we gladly give place in the SENTINEL:-*AMS January 1887, page 3.1*

“Through your kindness I have received the AMERICAN SENTINEL for January, February, March, October, and November, 1886. I have given them careful perusal, and have also noted some things to which, with your permission, I would like to reply in your columns.*AMS January 1887, page 3.2*

“As your aim and mine is only to know and to do what is right, and as it is not victory for its own sake, but for truth’s sake that we are (or ought to be) striving for, I feel sure you will cheerfully accord me the privilege of correcting what I regard as misstatements made (no doubt honestly) by you of the sentiments, purposes, and position of the National Reform Association. This, and not the ‘Religious Amendment party,’ or the ‘God-in-the-Constitution’ party, is our correct designation. These and all similar titles we disown and disclaim. Whatever may be the design of those who employ them, they convey a wrong, because a one-sided and imperfect, notion of the object of the National Reform Association.*AMS January 1887, page 3.3*

“Before however, proceeding to the correction of what I consider misinterpretations and misapprehensions of the declarations and views of the advocates of National Reform, I desire to enter my protest against the very serious charges you lay at their door. Although you pay a not undeserved tribute to the respectability, learning, piety, and patriot-ism of its published list of officers, over and over again you affirm that our professed object is one thing while our real object is another and a totally different thing (p. 76).

You assert that we are laboring to subvert the Constitution of our country (p. 78), and to overthrow all that was done by the Revolutionary fathers (p. 81); that we propose to put in practice persecution for conscience' sake (pp. 78, 84); that we are seeking our own aggrandizement (p. 86); that we are actuated by ambition (p. 76); and that our repeated re-affirmations or denials that we do not contemplate in any sense a union of Church and State is a mere blind (p. 19), a display of effrontery (p. 81), an exhibition of duplicity (p. 74), and a piece of Jesuitical casuistry to hide our real intention (p. 19). You also say that 'we do not see how we can expect anything else of that party. Its cause is worthy only of Jesuitism and the Inquisition, and can only be justified by such casuistry as a Jesuit might envy' (p. 20).*AMS January 1887, page 3.4*

"Do you really think, Messrs. Editors, that this is an honorable mode of warfare? Is it necessary to the success of your cause? If it is, then verily it must be a bad one. When such questionable measures have to be employed to defend it, it is 'condemned already.' If you think the advocates of National Reform are mistaken or misguided, have a zeal that is not according to knowledge, and do not perceive the natural and necessary consequences of their movement, you have an undaunted right to say so, and also to try to prove what you say. But to hold them up to public reprobation as deliberate and intentional deceivers is, to say the least, very unfair Insinuation, defamation, and aspersion of motives are not arguments. Let us reason together, but because we differ, let us not descend to vituperation.*AMS January 1887, page 3.5*

"A great deal of what you have written against the National Reform Association arises from a misreading (how to account for it I do not know) of the constitution of the Association. In almost every paper you sent mp (and I suppose the same is true of those I have not received), you say that the object of the National Reform, Association, in the Amendment to our National Constitution they wish incorporated in that instrument, is 'to legalize the laws and institutions of Christianity, or of that which they may claim is Christianity;' or 'to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis' (pp. 1, 3, 4). How foreign this is to our purpose will be seen almost at a glance by

comparing your way of putting it with the language of the constitution of the National Reform Association. As many of your readers may never have seen it, and as it is of itself a sufficient reply to much that has appeared in the SENTINEL, I ask as a matter of justice, and that your readers may have an opportunity of judging for themselves, that you publish it in full. The readers of the SENTINEL will do themselves a favor by referring to it as often as may be necessary.*AMS January 1887, page 3.6*

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

“Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations, and that the revealed Will of Cod is of Supreme authority in civil affairs;*AMS January 1887, page 3.7*

“Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men, with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established;*AMS January 1887, page 3.8*

“Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath Laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath, Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, pays of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion;*AMS January 1887, page 3.9*

“Viewing with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and the disregard of moral and religious character in those who are exalted to high places in the nation;*AMS January 1887, page 3.10*

“Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government;*AMS January 1887, page 3.11*

“We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves under the followings ARTICLES, and pledge ourselves to God, and to one another, to labor, through wise and lawful means, for the ends herein set forth:-*AMS January 1887, page 3.12*

ARTICLE I

“This Society shall be called the “NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.”*AMS January 1887, page 3.13*

ARTICLE II

“The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the Government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation’s allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.’*AMS January 1887, page 4.1*

“After reading this constitution law, can any one truthfully affirm that the aim of the National Reform Association is ‘to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis’? It distinctly specifies ‘the Christian laws, usages, and institutions of our Government’-these and no more. Between the statement of the SENTINEL, ‘to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental laws of the land,’ and the one in the constitution of the National Reform Association, ‘to place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government’ on such a basis, there is a world-wide difference. The former embraces all the doctrines, roles, and principles of Christianity; the latter only such ‘moral laws of the Christian religion’ as are necessarily involved in the practical administration of our Government. The chief of these are mentioned

in the constitution of the Association, and the undeniable fact 'that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government,' is asserted. The SENTINEL'S version of our aims and purposes is as wide of the mark as it possibly can be. To any such scheme as that attributed by the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to the friends of National Reform, the latter are as much opposed (and as honestly) as are or can be the former. The AMERICAN SENTINEL, therefore, is wasting its ammunition, firing at a specter of its own creating, fighting a ghost of its own imagining.*AMS January 1887, page 4.2*

"As this communication is already perhaps too long, I reserve, with your permission, further criticisms to a future article.*AMS January 1887, page 4.3*

"ROBERT WHITE.
"Steubenville, Ohio."

We have no desire to present a one-sided view, and shall always be glad to publish views of the other side when they are presented in as temperate and candid a manner as are the above. Indeed this has been our course from the first.*AMS January 1887, page 4.4*

Mr. White refers to several expressions which he has found in different numbers of the SENTINEL, and asks if we "really think that this is an honorable mode of warfare?" We can answer that if the expressions had been used with no director dependent connection, if they had been printed as a series of expletives with no explanation, we should not consider such to be an honorable mode of warfare. But when in every instance the expressions are simply and only the logical deduction from the propositions of the National Reformers themselves, then we are prepared to say without hesitancy that such is an honorable mode of warfare.*AMS January 1887, page 4.5*

It is an honorable mode of warfare to trace every proposition to its logical conclusion; and if sound logic demonstrates that while the professed object of National Reform is one thing, the real object is a totally different thing; if the logic of the thing shows that it is subversive of the constitution; if not only logical conclusions, but

their own words, show that the practice of persecution for conscience will be the outcome of the success of National Reformers; if sound logic develops casuistry and even Jesuitical casuistry; then we say that in all this there is nothing but an honorable mode of warfare.*AMS January 1887, page 4.6*

Mr. White speaks of our “insinuations,” etc. Now Webster’s Unabridged says that to insinuate is “to hint; to suggest by remote allusion.” So far as we know we have insinuated nothing. What we have had to say we have said openly and plainly. And if what we have said appears to him as “insinuations,” then we should be glad for him to tell us how we can speak plainly and directly.*AMS January 1887, page 4.7*

We wish Mr. White had spent his time in showing that our reasoning is not logical, and that our expressions are not the plain statements of logical conclusions from the propositions of National Reformers, instead of complaining of the expressions themselves. If our reasoning is not sound, if our conclusions are not logical, it ought to be easy enough for the principals in the movement to show it. There are certainly enough professors, and Doctors of Divinity, and Doctors of Laws, pledged to National Reform, to furnish some one to point out wherein we have reasoned wrongly, or where we have missed the point in our arguments on the propositions of the National Reformers. Besides this, if in our arguments we have so constantly missed the point of National Reform, how does it happen that our efforts hurt the National Reformers so much? If they are not hit, how does it happen that they are hurt? And if the real point of National Reform is missed, how does it happen that the National Reformers are hit?*AMS January 1887, page 4.8*

If the reader will look over the numbers of the SENTINEL, he will find copious extracts from the writings of National Reformers. We have endeavored to represent them fairly, and in order to do this, have uniformly quoted their own language. If we have misconstrued the sentiments, the purpose, and the position of the National Reform Association, it can only have been because its advocates have not meant what they said. In noticing the strictures of Mr. White, we shall simply re-quote a few statements made by National Reformers. And here we would say that we have never yet used the

expression “God-in-the-Constitution” party. We have referred to the National Reform Association as the “Religious Amendment party,” and we think justly, although they may disclaim that distinctive title. To show that this is so, we quote from a speech made by Professor Blanchard in the National Reform, Convention held in Pittsburg in 1874. He said:-*AMS January 1887, page 4.9*

“Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and, of course, Congress establishes a standard for money, weight, and measure. So Congress must establish a standard religion or admit anything called religion.”*AMS January 1887, page 4.10*

In the same convention President Brunot said:-*AMS January 1887, page 4.11*

“The American people must say that the Bible is the word of God, and that Christianity is the religion of this country.”*AMS January 1887, page 4.12*

In March, 1884, Rev. J. M. Foster, writing in the *Christian Statesman*, concerning the model State, said:-*AMS January 1887, page 4.13*

“According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere existed for the sake and to serve the interests of the church.” And again “The expenses of the church in carrying on her aggressive work it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury.”*AMS January 1887, page 4.14*

Rev. R. M. Somerville, in the *Christian Nation* of July 14, 1886; declared that it is right to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed.*AMS January 1887, page 4.15*

The National Reform Association has for its avowed object the securing of such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will indicate that this is a Christian Nation. And when that Amendment shall have been secured, Congress must, according to Professor Blanchard, establish a standard religion. If, then, the

Amendment which they desire is not a Religious Amendment, language does not mean anything. Moreover, Christianity cannot be separated from religion, for it *is* religion. A Christian man is a religious man and a Christian nation must be a religious nation; therefore we say again, that is the Constitution is so amended that this Nation shall *seem* to be a Christian Nation, the Amendment which secures that object will be a Religious Amendment. Although National Reformers repudiate the title of “Religious Amendment party,” their own writers proclaim the fact that they do want a religious test for citizenship. We do not see, therefore, how the emphatic declarations, made again and again by National Reformers, that they do not want a *Religious* Amendment to the Constitution, nor anything like Church and State, can be considered as anything else than a “blind,” or a manifestation of Jesuitical casuistry. *AMS January 1887, page 4.16*

In view of the above quotations, we think we are justified in calling the National Reformers the “Religious Amendment party.” In fact, we always wince whenever we write “National Reformers” and “National Reform Association,” for we cannot regard their movement as a reform in any particular. It is true that many advocates of this movement are highly respectable and learned and pious, and we cannot believe that they realize what will be the result of their proposed Amendment. But we cannot allow that they are patriots, even though they are honest in their purpose, for patriotism seeks only the welfare of the country, and the success of their movement would be the greatest calamity which this Nation ever suffered. We are obliged, however, to discredit the piety of many who stand high in the National Reform counsels, and the reason for this will shortly appear. *AMS January 1887, page 4.17*

Now a few words concerning constitution of the National Reform According Association. According to that its idea is to place “all Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.” If they purpose to follow the letter of their constitution, they might as well stop at once, for in our Government there are no Christian laws or institutions. “Christian laws” are precepts regulating the practice of the Christian religion. Christian institutions are those ordinances which Christ has placed in the church, as baptism and the Lord’s

supper. To claim that it is desired to regulate marriage laws, judicial oaths, and the observance of the Sabbath, we submit that these are not Christian institutions. The moral law of ten commandments antedates Christianity and is obligatory on all mankind. For the observance or non-observance of its precepts, Jew and Gentile, Pagan and Christian, will alike have to give an account to God. That part of the law which relates especially to man's duty to his fellows and tends to secure harmony and good order in society, human Governments are empowered to enforce, and that without regard to the form of religion that may be professed. The Czar of Russia, the Shah of Persia, the emperors of China and Japan, the queen of England, and the President of the United States are alike ministers of God to execute wrath upon those who trample upon the rights of their neighbors. And it is a fact that in many heathen countries the rights of citizens have been as well maintained as in some so-called Christian nations. It is also a fact that there is no such thing as Christianity in marriage. Marriage was instituted in Eden for the whole race, and the marriage of the Jew is just as sacred as that of the Protestant. The regulation of marriage is within the province of every nation, whether it is Christian or Pagan.*AMS January 1887, page 4.18*

Mr. White uses the expression "moral laws of the Christian religion." This is simply an absurdity. The Christian religion has no moral laws. The moral law is of primary and universal obligation. It covers every conceivable act or thought. If the moral law had never been broken there would be no necessity for the Christian religion, but since it has been violated, Christianity is the means devised to bring man back to obedience to it. We cannot refrain from saying, what we believe to be the truth, that if those who call themselves National Reformers had a just conception of the true object of the Christian religion, and of the Spirit which actuated its Founder, they would cease their efforts to tamper with the Constitution of the United States. Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and steadfastly resisted all human efforts to make him king. When two of his disciples wished to call down fire upon some who did not acknowledge his divinity, he rebuked them, saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." And when Peter drew his sword in defense of the Master, he was sternly rebuked.*AMS January 1887, page 5.1*

Mr. White is grieved because the SENTINEL attributes to National Reformers the purpose to put in practice persecution for conscience' sake. Let National Reformers answer for themselves on this point. Rev. Jonathan Edwards, one of the vice-presidents of the Association, says: "Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon." And the same man classes deists, Jews, Seventh-day Baptists, and, in fact, all who deny the claims of the National Reform Association, as atheists. And now remembering that opposition to the so-called National Reform movement is counted as infidelity and atheism, we quote the following from another vice-president, Rev. E. B. Graham. He says:-*AMS January 1887, page 5.2*

"If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features let them go to some wild, desolate land, and, in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it and set up a Government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die."*AMS January 1887, page 5.3*

This is the fate to which at least one National Reformer would consign, not only those who deny the existence of God, but also those who, believing in God and Christ and the Bible, are content to rely upon the aid of the Spirit of God alone in their efforts to spread the gospel, and who refuse to invoke civil aid in that work, or to yield their consciences to the will of any human power. Again we quote from the pen of Rev. M. A. Gault, one of the leading lights of the National Reform Association. He says:-*AMS January 1887, page 5.4*

"Whether the Constitution will be set right on the question of the moral supremacy of God's law in Government without a bloody revolution, will depend entirely on the strength and resistance of the forces of antichrist."*AMS January 1887, page 5.5*

That is to say that National Reformers are ready to shed blood if need be in order to enforce their ideas of Christian morality upon the people. If this does not mean persecution for conscience' sake, then such a thing never existed. It may be that we have been mistaken in charging duplicity and Jesuitical casuistry upon National

Reformers who claim that they desire no union of Church and State, and that the success of their movement cannot result in persecution; but if so, then we are forced to attribute to them a degree of ignorance which is inconceivable.*AMS January 1887, page 5.6*

Once more: The *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884, stated its desire to join hands with Roman Catholics in carrying forward the work of National Reform. And in the *Statesman* of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, speaking of this desire to secure the co-operation of Roman Catholics, said:-*AMS January 1887, page 5.7*

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike bands with other churches, as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation."*AMS January 1887, page 5.8*

Now when we remember what the Catholic Church has been and has done in the past, and that it is the church's boast that Rome never changes, and that in the encyclical letter published by Pope Leo XIII. only a little over a year ago, every act of every Pope was endorsed, certainly every one who is not willingly blind must see that when National Reformers co-operate with the Catholic Church on its own terms, and when by such co-operation they have secured the power which they desire, persecution will follow as a matter of course. The idea that in matters of religion the minority must submit to the majority is of long standing with Roman Catholics, and is openly avowed by National Reformers. But minorities do not always submit willingly, and if that idea is carried out, force must be used.*AMS January 1887, page 5.9*

But space forbids our making further quotations. We submit to Mr. White that it is strictly an honorable mode of warfare to condemn an opponent out of his own mouth. We have made no statements concerning National Reformers which the facts will not warrant. While we cannot believe that all self-styled National Reformers are actuated by sincere motives, we do believe that many of them are honest at heart and desire only the truth, but are deceived as to the

real object and the necessary result of the National Reform Association. In this latter class we gladly place our correspondent. And as our desire is to reclaim those who have fallen into error, as well as to bring the real truth before all, we hold our columns open to any one who is competent and authorized to speak for the National Reform Association, who shall wish to make a statement as to its nature and object. E. J. W.*AMS January 1887, page 5.10*

February 1887

“The Legacy from Our Fathers” American Sentinel 2, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

One of the stock arguments of the National Reformers in favor of their movement is that loyalty to the memory of our forefathers demands it. One of the reasons given in the preamble of their constitution is, “that this country was settled by Christian men with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established.” And “the legacy which we have received from our fathers” is a common method of commending those “Christian institutions” which they wish to enforce by civil law. We wish to notice a few things in the early history of our country to see how strong this argument really is.*AMS February 1887, page 11.1*

One of the institutions which we received as a legacy from our fathers was slavery. All are acquainted with the fact that in the colonies, both North and South, slavery was practiced. In McMaster’s “History of the People of the United States” we read the following:-*AMS February 1887, page 11.2*

“If the infamy of holding slaves belongs to the South, the greater infamy of supplying slaves must be shared by England and the North. While the States were yet colonies, to buy negroes and sell them into slavery had become a scourge of profit to the inhabitants of many New England towns. Scarce a year passed by but numbers of slavers went out from Boston, from Medford, from Salem, from Providence, from Newport, from Bristol, in Rhode Island. The trade was of a threefold kind: Molasses brought from Jamaica was turned to rum; the rum dispatched to Africa bought negroes; the negroes, carried to Jamaica or the Southern ports, were exchanged for molasses, which, in turn, taken back to New England, was quickly made into rum.”-*Chap. 7, par. 15.AMS February 1887, page 11.3*

It cost the nation millions of dollars and thousands of lives to get rid of this legacy, yet Mr. Gault, speaking of the National Reform Association, is willing to have another revolution equally bloody, if

necessary to secure their ends.*AMS February 1887, page 11.4*

But slavery will hardly be called a Christian institution, hence it cannot be what they refer to in their constitution. We must remember, however, that it was engaged in by the Christian men who settled this country; and even they could not give it a Christian character. Let us look, then, at some of the acts which they did in the name of and for Christianity. In the "Encyclopedia Britannica," art. "Quakers," we read the following:-*AMS February 1887, page 11.5*

"The earliest appearance of Quakers in America is a remarkable one. In July, 1656, two women Quakers, Mary Fisher and Aria Austin, arrived at Boston. Under the general law against heresy their books were burnt by the hangman, they were searched for signs of witchcraft, they were imprisoned for five weeks and then sent away. During the same year eight others were sent back to England.*AMS February 1887, page 11.6*

"In 1657 and 1658 laws were passed to prevent the introduction of Quakers into Massachusetts, and it was enacted that on the first conviction one ear should be cut off, on the second the remaining ear, and that on the third conviction the tongue should be gored with a hot iron. Fines were laid upon all who entertained Quakers or were present at their meetings. Thereupon the Quakers, who were perhaps not without the obstinacy of which Marcus Antoninus complained in the early Christians, rushed to Massachusetts as if invited, and the result was that the general court of the colony banished them on pain of death, and four Quakers, three men and one woman, were hung for refusing to depart from the jurisdiction, or obstinately returning within it. That the Quakers were irritating cannot be denied; some of them appear to have publicly mocked the institutions and the rulers of the colony, and to have interrupted public worship; and some of their men and women too acted with fanaticism and disorder. But even such conduct furnishes but a poor apology for inflicting stripes and death on men and women. The particulars of the proceedings of Governor Endicott and the magistrates of New England as given in Besse are startling to read. On the restoration of Charles II. a memorial was presented to him by the Quakers in England, stating the persecutions which their

fellow members had undergone in New England. Even the careless Charles was moved to issue an order to the colony which effectually stopped the hanging of Quakers for their religion, though it by no means put an end to the persecution of the body in New England.”*AMS February 1887, page 11.7*

In McClintock and Strong’s Encyclopedia, art. “Baptists,” we find the following as a further illustration of how the Puritan Fathers put the stamp of Christianity on this country:-*AMS February 1887, page 11.8*

“Massachusetts issues laws against them in 1644, imprisoned several Baptists in 1651, and banished others in 1669. In 1680 the doors of a Baptist meeting-house were nailed up. In New York laws were issued against them in 1662, in Virginia in 1664. with the beginning of the eighteenth century the persecution greatly abated. They were released from tithes in 1727 in Massachusetts, in 1729 in New Hampshire and Connecticut, but not before 1785 in Virginia. The spread of their principles was greatly hindered by these persecutions.”*AMS February 1887, page 11.9*

In Bancroft’s “History of the United States,” we find an account of the struggle which Roger Williams and the Baptists had for religious liberty. Since the National Re-formers are desirous of having this country sustain the same relation to religion which it did then, we quote quite largely from those chapters. In the following paragraphs the reader will find a very correct picture of the result of National Reform principles:-*AMS February 1887, page 12.1*

“A fugitive from English persecution, he had revolved the nature of intolerance, and had arrived at its only effectual remedy, the sanctity of conscience. In soul matters, he would have no weapons but soul weapons. The civil magistrate should restrain crime, but never control opinion; should punish guilt, but never violate inward freedom. The principle contained within itself an entire reformation of theological jurisprudence; it would blot from the statute-book the felony of non-conformity; would quench the fires that persecution had so long kept burning; would repeal every law compelling attendance on public worship; would abolish tithes and all forced contributions to the maintenance of religion; would give an equal

protection to every form of religious faith; and never suffer the force of the Government to be employed against the dissenter's meeting-house, the Jewish synagogue, or the Roman cathedral. In the unwavering assertion of his views, he never changed his position; the sanctity of con-science was the great tenet, which, with all its consequences, he defended, as he first trod the shores of New England; and, in his extreme old age, it was the last pulsation of his heart. The doctrine was a logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, as well of justification by faith alone as of the equality of all believers; and it was sure to be one day accepted by the whole Protestant world. But it placed the young emigrant in direct opposition to the system of the founders of Massachusetts, who were bent on making the State a united body of believers." *AMS February 1887, page 12.2*

"The Government avoided an explicit rupture with the Church of England; Williams would hold no communion with it on account of its intolerance; 'for,' said he, 'the doctrine of persecution for cause of conscience is most evidently and lamentably contrary to the doctrine of Christ Jesus.' The magistrates insisted on the presence of every man at public worship; Williams reprobated the law; the worst statute in the English code was that which did but enforce attendance upon the parish church. To compel men to unite with those of a different creed, be regarded as an open violation of their natural rights; to drag to public worship the irreligious and the unwilling seemed only like requiring hypocrisy. 'An unbelieving soul is dead in sin,' such was his argument; and to force the indifferent from one worship to another 'was like shifting a dead man into several changes of apparel.' 'No one should be bound to worship, or,' he added, 'to maintain a worship, against his own consent.' 'What!' exclaimed his antagonists, amazed at his tenets; 'is not the laborer worthy of his hire?' 'Yes,' replied he, 'from them that hire him.' *AMS February 1887, page 12.3*

"The Magistrates were selected exclusively from the members of the church; with equal propriety, reasoned Williams, might 'a doctor physick or a pilot' be selected according to his skill in theology and his standing in the church." -*Chap. 9, par. 54, 70, 71. AMS February 1887, page 12.4*

“Anabaptism was to the establishment a dangerous rival. When Clarke, the pure and tolerant Baptist of Rhode Island, one of the happy few who have connected their name with the liberty and happiness of a commonwealth, began to preach to a small audience in Lynn, he was seized by the civil officers. Being compelled to attend public worship with the congregation of the town, he expressed his aversion by a harmless indecorum, which would have been without excuse, had his presence been voluntary. He and his companions were tried, and condemned to pay a fine of twenty or thirty pounds; and Holmes, who refused to pay his fine, was whipped unmercifully.*AMS February 1887, page 12.5*

‘ Since a particular form of worship had become apart of the civil establishment, irreligion was now to be punished as a civil offense. The State was a model of Christ’s kingdom on earth; treason against the civil Government was treason against Christ; and reciprocally, as the gospel had the right paramount, blasphemy, or what a jury should call blasphemy, was the highest offense in the catalogue of crimes. To deny any book of the Old or New Testament to be the written and infallible word of God was punishable by fine or by stripes, and in case of obstinacy, by exile or death. Absence from ‘the ministry of the word’ was punished by a fine.*AMS February 1887, page 12.6*

“By degrees the spirit of the establishment began to subvert the fundamental principles of independency. The liberty of prophesying was refused, except the approbation of four elders, or of a county court, had been obtained. Remonstrance was useless. The union of Church and State was fast corrupting both: it mingled base ambition with the former; it gave a false direction to the legislation of the latter. And in 1658 the general court claimed for itself, for the counsel, and for any two organic churches, the right of silencing any person who was not as yet ordained. The creation of a national, uncompromising church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which had disgraced their English persecutors; and Laud was justified by the men whom he had wronged.”-Chap. 10, par. 78-80.*AMS February 1887, page 12.7*

Many more quotations might be made, but these are sufficient. Let

it be remembered that the men who practiced these cruelties were Christian men urged on by Christian ministers. These men were no worse than are the men who to-day occupy similar positions. Their action was simply the natural result of the idea that the State was “a model of Christ’s kingdom on earth.” And this, let it be remembered, is the position taken by National Reformers. Whoever wishes to know the result of the success of the National Reform Association, has only to read the history of the Salem Witchcraft and of the persecutions of the dissenting Baptists and Quakers. Those are the only “Christian features” which our forefathers gave to the Government. We do not wish to disparage the men who settled this country; they lived up to the light which they had. They had themselves suffered oppression for their religious convictions, and had never known such a thing as religious toleration, consequently it took them some time to accord to others that freedom which they demanded for themselves.*AMS February 1887, page 12.8*

But we are happy to say that these “Christian features” were not permanently stamped upon our Government. By the time that the ship of State was fairly launched, men had learned more of the principles of religious toleration. The Declaration of Independence recognized the fact that all men had equal rights, and the Constitution of the United States declares that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion prohibiting the free exercise thereof” and that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust, under the United States.”*AMS February 1887, page 12.9*

The Constitution comprises all that we have received from our forefathers. We believe it to be the best Constitution ever formed by man, because it carefully guards the rights of all, and leaves the conscience of everyone free. It is this Constitution which makes the United States the best country in the world for the spread of the gospel. And allows perfect freedom for the preaching of the gospel from the Bible alone, we are desirous of having it kept as it is, and we cannot countenance those men who, having far more light than the Puritan Fathers had, would revive in this country the practice of the Dark Ages.*AMS February 1887, page 12.10*

E. J. W.

March 1887

“A Substitute for the Church” American Sentinel 2, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 16, 1886, after considering the manner in which the Labor Party in Philadelphia was captured by Socialists said:-*AMS March 1887, page 18.1*

These proceedings, taken in connection with the utterances of Henry George and his supporters in the campaign, the intercession of the Knights of Labor in convention at Richmond for the condemned Anarchists at Chicago, the efforts which have been made to secure for them a new trial, and the stay of proceedings granted by the Supreme Court which reprieves them for five months, are ominous signs of the impending social struggle. They render more timely and significant too the religious declarations in the platforms of the Prohibition party, and the efforts which are to be made to secure such acknowledgments by all existing parties. The party which will make and adhere to a simple and hearty acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the actual ruler of nations, and of the supreme authority of his moral laws, will, by virtue of that very fact, become the leading party in the struggle which is even now upon us. There are multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform and who will be powerfully attracted toward any party which declares for a fearless and uniform application of the law of God to civil affairs.”*AMS March 1887, page 18.2*

We agree with the *Statesman* that these are ominous signs of the impending social struggle. We do not think that the danger to which this country is subject from the Socialistic element can be overestimated. But we cannot see how this danger is to be averted by the formation of a political party whose platform shall contain religious declarations. There is no condition of affairs which the *Statesman*, or any lover of order, may desire to see, which cannot be brought about by the simple influence of the gospel, if it can be brought about at all; that is to say, if the spread of Socialistic ideas is prevented at all, it must be through the gospel, which is directly opposed to Socialism. Just to the extent that the gospel is

accepted, the spread of Socialism will be hindered. The *Statesman* admits this when it says, "There are multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform and who will be powerfully attracted to any party that declares for the fearless and uniform application of the law of God to civil affairs." *AMS March 1887, page 18.3*

The acceptance of the gospel is necessarily an acceptance of the entire Bible, the moral law included, for the apostle Peter, speaking of the word of God, says: "This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." *1 Peter 1:25*. The sole business of the church is to teach the gospel; therefore it is the church's duty to declare for the "fearless and uniform application of the law of God," not only to civil affairs but to every affair in life. Thus the Lord, speaking to the church through the prophet Isaiah said: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." *Isaiah 58:1*. The church was established for the express purpose of "holding forth the word of life" and teaching obedience to the law of God, at the same time that it announces pardon for sins already committed. If it does its duty it teaches men how to regulate their conduct toward one another, by announcing Christ's summary of the second table of the decalogue: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." *AMS March 1887, page 19.1*

The church is not only the body that is appointed to teach the application of the law of God to human affairs, but it is the only power to which this duty has been committed. Moreover, it is the best adapted for the carrying on of this work, because it addresses itself to the individual, and not to mankind as a whole. If it were possible to entirely convert men from Socialistic ideas, then the church, dealing as it does with individuals, would present the most feasible plan of work. For if each Socialist were converted, Socialism would be at an end. We do not wish to be understood as claiming that the church should be expected to convert all men, for the Bible expressly declares that but few will find the way leading to life. But we do say that as far as any progress is made in bringing men to the acceptance of the law of God, it must be made by the church. A political party with a religious platform would simply be trying to do the work which the church is set to do. The *Statesman*

says that such a party would draw multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform. If that be true, why are they not drawn to the church? The answer is simply because they do not care for the law of God, but for their own selfish aims. If therefore they were drawn to such a political party it would be because they could gain political preferment.*AMS March 1887, page 19.2*

We should think that for professed Christians to announce that the work which should be done by the church can be done only by political parties would be a humiliating confession. When the church itself applies to the civil power for aid, it acknowledges that it has lost its own power; the spirit of the gospel has departed from it, and the salt has lost its savor. They may *seem* to get what they desire, namely, the peace of the millennium, but it will be only the shell with a blasted kernel inside. If the church has lost its power to convert men, of what used will a "religious" party be? "If the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?"*AMS March 1887, page 19.3*

E. J. W.

"Ethics of Sunday Legislation" American Sentinel 2, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

In quite a number of the States there is at present considerable stir over the passage of Sunday laws. This is directly in the line of National Reform work, and is a danger to American liberty, of which the AMERICAN SENTINEL, as a watchful guardian, must give warning. There are very many people who are opposed to the work of so-called National Reform, who would heartily support a law enforcing Sunday observance, not perceiving that the very argument against National Reform in general is equally valid against this particular phase of that work. We purpose to note a few features of Sunday legislation, and how it will work injustice to a large class of citizens.*AMS March 1887, page 21.1*

There are two grounds upon which Sunday legislation is based: one the civil, and the other the religious; and the two are antagonistic, although both are often held by the same individual. On one side it is claimed that Sunday should be enforced, not as a

religious institution, but as a civil holiday, and that Sunday laws are to be regarded as police regulations. Others plead for laws enforcing Sunday rest, on the ground that Sunday is the “Christian Sabbath.” But upon whichever ground Sunday legislation is urged, such legislation is entirely inconsistent with perfect civil and religious liberty. If it be urged that man’s physical nature requires rest on one day in seven, and that the Government should set apart Sunday as a civil holiday, and restrain people from working thereon, it comes directly in conflict with all usage in respect to holidays, and cannot be consistently sustained by sound reason. There are quite a number of days that are set apart as national holidays, yet on none of them are people forcibly restrained from labor if they choose to work. This very fact shows the absurdity of the claim that Sunday legislation is not religious legislation, for no advocate of Sunday laws would be content for a moment with a law placing the day on a level with other holidays.*AMS March 1887, page 21.2*

Again, the absurdity of the idea of enforcing Sunday observance because of man’s physical need for rest is equally evident. For example: It is just as certain that man’s physical nature requires a certain amount of sleep in every twenty-four hours as it is that his physical nature requires rest one day in seven. It is an undeniable truth that thousands of people do not take regular rest, and that they suffer physically because of the lack of a proper amount of sleep. Now if it be granted that a State has a right to enforce Sunday observance because people need the physical rest, then it necessarily follows that the State has a right to enact that everybody shall take a given amount of rest in each twenty-four hours. And on that ground we might expect the Government to compel people to go to bed every night at ten o’clock, and to prescribe the hour when they should arise. It is certain that no one can maintain Sunday legislation from a civil standpoint, and it is equally certain that no one really has this in view.*AMS March 1887, page 21.3*

It must be, then, that it is as the “Christian Sabbath” that the plea is made for enforced Sunday observance. But when it is put upon this ground, we have the State legislating on matters of religion, and thus stepping outside of its sphere. Indeed, Sunday legislation stands for union of Church and State. For if the State can legislate

in behalf of one Christian institution, it may with equal propriety legislate in behalf of all of them. If it can enforce the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," it has also a right to enforce Christian baptism. But the right to enforce any religious tenet depends upon the right to decide upon matters of faith, for before the State legislates in behalf of any practice, it must first decide that that practice is correct. Indeed, such decision is implied in the very act of passing the law. Therefore we say, if the State can enforce the observance of the Christian Sabbath, it may also enforce baptism, and may determine what Christian baptism is, whether sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. It may also with equal propriety enforce the sacrament of the Lord's Supper on all within its jurisdiction, and can determine how it shall be celebrated, whether in one kind or in both. And this is union of Church and State, as much as has ever existed in any age or in any nation. So we say that all, no matter what their religious belief, who are opposed to the union of Church and State, must be opposed to the enactment of Sunday laws.*AMS March 1887, page 21.4*

But whether the observance of Sunday be enforced from a civil or from a religious standpoint, it cannot fail to be unjust and oppressive to a large class of law-abiding citizens. We refer to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week. We know that it is commonly urged that Sunday laws do not interfere with the rights of any Sabbatarian, because they leave him perfectly free to carry out his conscientious convictions by resting on the seventh day of the week. But if it is man's religious *duty* to rest on one day in seven, which all advocates of Sunday laws allow, then it is also his religious *privilege* to labor on six days in seven. Now if a man conscientiously believes that the word of God demands that he shall rest upon the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and the State compels him also to rest upon the first day of the week, it is certain that his religious privileges are interfered with.*AMS March 1887, page 21.5*

Again, if rigid Sunday laws are enacted, and a man is punished for laboring on Sunday after having conscientiously kept Saturday, such punishment is nothing less than persecution for conscience' sake. His punishment is really as much for his observance of the seventh day as it is for laboring on the first day. Thus: Necessity

compels him to labor six days in the week for the support of his family; and the divine command certainly gives him the privilege of working six days, it it does not really command it. But his conscience imperatively forbids him to labor on Saturday, the seventh day of the week, therefore necessity and religion compel him to labor on the first day of the week. That is to say, his labor on the first day of the week is made necessary by his conscientious observance of the seventh day of the week. So then if he is punished for his first day labor, he is equally punished for his seventh day rest; and so it becomes clear that the enactment of Sunday laws, and the execution of penalties for the violation thereof, is simply persecution for conscience' sake.*AMS March 1887, page 21.6*

We are not now concerned as to whether Sunday is or is not the Christian Sabbath; in either case the argument is the same. Neither if we take, it for granted that Sunday is the rest-day enjoined by divine command, is there, as some claim, any analogy between the punishment by civil authority, of a man who quietly labors on that day, and the punishment of the polygamist, even allowing that the polygamist is conscientious in his practice; for polygamy is the violation of the seventh commandment, which is contained in the second table of the decalogue, defining the relations of men with one another, and is thus a proper subject for civil legislation. But the keeping of the Sabbath is enjoined by the fourth commandment, which is a part of the first table of the decalogue, defining man's duty to God, and is not a proper matter for civil legislation. The polygamist and the adulterer, for a polygamist is an adulterer, sins not alone against God, but against society in general, and some person or persons in particular. Like the thief, he takes that which belongs to some one else, and to which he has no right. But the man who pursues his own lawful occupation on the first day of the week, interferes with no one's rights or privileges. He deprives no conscientious observer of that day, of his Sabbath, even if he observes no day whatever; so long as he does not disturb the rest and worship of anyone else, he is answerable alone to God.*AMS March 1887, page 22.1*

Again, Sunday legislation virtually places a premium upon crime. This may seem a bold and unwarranted statement, but we can easily show its truthfulness. I have before me the bill which it is

purposed to have passed by the present California Legislature. It provides that every person that shall sell goods, keep open any store or other place of business, or shall sell or give away to be drunk any spirituous, vinous, malt, or other intoxicating liquors, on the first day of the week, or who shall engage in any riot, fighting, horse-racing, gambling, or other public sport, exercises, or shows, or any person who shall keep open any place where such sports, exercises, or shows, are carried on, shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor. It will be seen that gambling, rioting, fighting, and the selling of intoxicating liquor, are placed on a level with the keeping open of stores to sell goods. The sale of goods at proper times is not only legitimate, but it is absolutely necessary. It is wrong only when engaged in upon the day divinely set apart for rest. Now to pass a law forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors upon Sunday, saying nothing about its sale upon other days, puts that business on a level with legitimate industry, and virtually says that the sale of intoxicating liquors is all right upon any day but Sunday.*AMS March 1887, page 22.2*

As a matter of fact, liquor selling is an unmitigated evil; it does nobody any good, but does untold harm. The only one whom it enriches is the man who sells it. It is a drain upon all classes of citizens. The man who drinks spends his money without receiving an equivalent; his family is robbed of that which rightfully belongs to them; and the man who abstains entirely is taxed in order that the paupers, insane people, and criminals, that are made by the sale of intoxicating liquor may be provided for. And now for the State to enact a law enforcing the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," and declaring that the carrying on of the business of liquor selling is a violation of the "Christian Sabbath," and therefore punishable by a fine, is simply to place the infamous traffic on a level with the dry-goods or grocery business, and to say that it is all right to engage in it on any day but Sunday.*AMS March 1887, page 22.3*

That this is putting a premium upon crime, may be made still more apparent. Suppose the State should enact a law to the effect that anyone who should steal or commit a murder upon the first day of the week, should be deemed guilty of felony and should be punished, everybody would cry out against such a law. They would say that stealing and murder are in themselves criminal, and that

the perpetration of those crimes on the first day of the week does not add to the criminality of the act. They would justly claim that such legislation virtually made murder and theft legitimate acts if committed on any other day than Sunday, thus putting a premium upon crime. The case is the same with Sunday laws wherever they exist or are proposed. By specifying gambling, the selling of intoxicating liquor, etc., they virtually place such occupations in the list of legitimate employments when pursued on any other day. And so we say that Sunday legislation is not only contrary to religious liberty, but it is also against the interests of true morality.*AMS March 1887, page 22.4*

Next month we purpose to take up this matter still further and demonstrate these propositions by actual facts.*AMS March 1887, page 22.5*

E. J. W.

May 1887

“National Reform Principles Despotic” American Sentinel 2, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

We have received an address which a gentleman of Quincy, Mass., has addressed to the Legislature of that State. The writer strongly objects to making the Sunday laws any less strict, or to making concessions in favor of any, and says:-*AMS May 1887, page 36.1*

“The greatest good to the greatest number of our citizens, demands that the Sunday laws shall remain unchanged. They may be slightly oppressive in some respects, but the Legislature which is capable of pruning them just enough to make them perfect, and stopping at that point, has, in my humble opinion, yet to be elected. Better let well enough alone.”*AMS May 1887, page 36.2*

This is the idea that underlies all National Reform would-be legislation,-the idea that laws are simply for the majority, that if the majority are satisfied it matters not if a few are oppressed. Such an idea of law is in harmony with despotism, but not with a republican, or any other just form of government. A despotism is simply the rule of the majority, only the majority of strength is lodged in one man. But the principle is the same, no matter whether the majority of strength be lodged in one man, or whether the numerical majority has the majority of strength. Five hundred men have no more right to unite to oppress one man, than one man has to oppress five hundred men.*AMS May 1887, page 36.3*

It is not true that a just law is ever oppressive to a few. A law that does injustice to one man, is an unjust law. We heartily agree with President Cleveland, who, in a recent interview on the land laws, said:-*AMS May 1887, page 36.4*

“If by any construction of a law, seeming injustice is done to the humblest the farmer in the furthest corner of the land, then that law ought to be changed, and changed at once.”*AMS May 1887, page 36.5*

If a law oppresses a single honest man, it has in it the elements of oppression, and so is an unjust and oppressive law. Just laws cannot by any possibility be made to oppress an upright man. This is the principle upon which our laws are framed. It is a legal maxim that it is better to let a guilty man escape than to punish an innocent man. This does not imply that a just law will sanction the escape of a guilty man, but it simply recognizes the fact that men are fallible, and are liable to improperly execute even a just law; and therefore it provides that the failure, if there be any failure, shall lean to the side of mercy.*AMS May 1887, page 36.6*

The fact that National Reformers claim that majorities should have their way, even though it might oppress some citizens, shows that if they should gain control oppression would certainly follow. Let us beware of despotism, whatever form it may assume. E. J. W.*AMS May 1887, page 36.7*

“Personal Liberty” American Sentinel 2, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The editor of the *Christian Union* Dr. Lyman Abbott, is writing in his paper a series of “Letters to Workingmen,” in which he is discussing the labor problem. In the issue of March 10, he considers the principle of strikes and boycotts, and among other illustrations he gives the following:-*AMS May 1887, page 36.8*

“My friend Michael S. owns a horse and cart. He goes out to work with his horse and cart, and for a day’s work receives \$3.50. he is a capital workman, and is always in great demand.... His horse and his cart are his own. I have no right to tell him where or how he can use them. If he should choose now to get a Pole to help him load his cart, and I should not like Poles, and should say to him, ‘Mr. S. you must not have a Pole to help you; you must have an American or an Irishman,’ I should expect the same answer from him, ‘Mind your own business. This is my horse and cart,’ he would say, ‘and I am one free man, and this Pole is another free man, and if he chooses to help me, and I choose to have him help me, it is none of your business.’ And it would clearly be none of my business. And it would not dignify or materially improve my impertinence, if I should

go round our village and stir up the people to demand of Mr. S. that he only use his horse and cart so many hours a day, or get only Irishmen or Americans as helpers. I might perhaps succeed in making life so uncomfortable for Mr. S. that he would yield. But if he did, it is palpably clear that he would yield to an impertinence and an injustice.*AMS May 1887, page 36.9*

There is also in our village a steam saw-mill. The men who own it have built it up by hard work, thrift, and economy. They have acquired it just as Michael S. has acquired his horse and cart, by honest industry. It is theirs, honestly theirs. Suppose I should undertake to tell them how many hours they may work their mill, and whether they may employ a Pole in it; this would be no less an impertinence. I have a little garden, and I sometimes work in it with garden tools which I have bought with my own money. It is nobody's business but my own when or how I work, or what I do with my tools. And it nobody's business but their own when or how my friend Michael S. works with his horse and cart, or my friends, the owners of the steam-mill, work with their steam-mill, or whom they get to help them."*AMS May 1887, page 37.1*

This is sound doctrine, and nobody can gainsay it. That every man is of right master of his own actions, so long as he does no injury to his fellow-men, is self-evident. This is in harmony with our famous declaration of human rights: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." And this was but the enunciation of the Golden Rule, the divine law which says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." That means that in every transaction with a fellow-man you should "put yourself in his place." I love liberty, and do not like to be dictated to arbitrarily; therefore I must allow others the same freedom by not presuming to interfere in their affairs.*AMS May 1887, page 37.2*

If I have hired myself to another man, I have the liberty to leave his employ if I do not like the work or the wages. But here is B. who is satisfied with both the work and the wages. Now if I say to him, "I am dissatisfied, and am going to leave, and therefore you must leave too," all right-minded people can see that it would be

insufferable impertinence on my part, which B., if he has the spirit of a man, will resent or ignore. If I bring influences to bear which he cannot resist, and force him to leave, I make him my slave. In so doing I violate the fundamental principles of all morality; for I certainly do to him What I would not like to have him do to me, thus showing that I do not love my neighbor as myself; and “he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?” *AMS May 1887, page 37.3*

THE RIGHT TO REST

Dr. Abbott says: “I have a little garden, and I sometimes work in it with garden tools which I have bought with my own money. It is nobody’s business but my own how or when I work, or what I do with my own tools.” Now suppose we make a little broader application of the principles above laid down. Dr. Abbott’s neighbor across the street has a garden also, in which he works when occasion demands. Some fine summer morning while Dr. A. is working in his garden, neighbor C comes over, and says: “Dr. Abbott, you must not work in your garden to-day.” “Why not?” “Because I am going to take a holiday to-day,” says C. “Very well,” says the Doctor, “go ahead, and have your holiday; I have no objection; but I don’t feel as though I could afford a holiday to-day, for I took one yesterday; therefore I shall continue work.” Everybody will say that Dr. A. does just right, and most people will say that if neighbor C. should insist on his laying off for the day, the Doctor would be justified in politely signifying to him that he better mind his own business. *AMS May 1887, page 37.4*

The case would be none the less absurd if Mr. C. should come over to Dr. A.’s garden, and say: “Doctor, I want you to stop work to-day, for I have worked very hard for several days past, and I feel as though it would be an injury to my physical system if I should work to-day. It is a law of nature that man should have regular periods of rest, and I am going to take mine to-day, and so you must rest too.” Dr. A. would say: “I rested all day yesterday, and feel perfectly refreshed. My system is in good condition, and does not at present require rest; if you need rest, I would certainly advise you to take it at once; my corn needs attention, and it would be wrong for me to neglect it, when I can attend to it as well as not; but I will not lay a

straw in the way of your resting; go right home and rest.”*AMS May 1887, page 37.5*

Will not everybody say that C.’s request is very unreasonable, and that if he should insist upon it, and should force Dr. A. to leave his quiet work in his garden, he would be acting most unjustly? None could say otherwise; for Dr. A.’s working does not in the least interfere with Mr. C.’s resting.*AMS May 1887, page 37.6*

The reader sees by this time that we are not discussing the labor problem, in the generally accepted sense of that term; and yet the principles which apply in the matter of strikes and boycotts, apply equally to the matter of Sunday rest or labor. If I choose to rest on Sunday I have that privilege, but I have no right to say that somebody else must rest just because I do. If my neighbors choose to work in their shops or gardens on Sunday, they do not hinder me from resting. In like manner if I choose to rest on Saturday, I have no right to request or demand that others shall likewise rest, unless they feel free to do so.*AMS May 1887, page 37.7*

We know that the plea is constantly being made that observers of Sunday must be protected in their right to rest. We readily agree. No man on earth, nor any company of men, has the right to say that another man shall work on Sunday. To do so would be a gross interference with his rights. But, by the same rule, no man, or set of men, has the right to say that another man shall not work on Sunday. A man may say, “You shall not work *for me* on Sunday;” a corporation may say, “You shall not work *for us* on Sunday;” and they have the right to say so to any man any day in the week. But when they undertake to say, “You shall not work for yourself, or for some other man if he wishes to hire you,” they are going beyond their rights.*AMS May 1887, page 37.8*

THE RIGHT OF CONSCIENCE

But the case is put as a matter of conscience. Thus, A. says, “My conscience requires me to rest on Sunday, and it offends and grieves me sorely to see others working on that day. To be sure, it doesn’t hinder me from resting, but it disturbs my peace of mind.” Well, suppose we interview your neighbor who thus disturbs your

peace of mind. B. says, "My conscience and my understanding of the Bible demand that I should rest on Saturday, and consequently labor on Sunday. It grieves me sorely to see neighbor A. working as I am going to church, and my worship is often disturbed by the rattling of his heavy wagon, or the sound of his hammer." Now is there any principle which can be invoked to uphold the State in compelling B. to rest on Sunday, so that A.'s feelings shall not be ruffled, while it allows A. to go his way on Saturday, regardless of the feelings of B.? We have never heard of any, except that ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people want to rest on Sunday, while only about one one-hundredth of the people care to rest on Saturday. But this is the principle that the wishes of the majority must be gratified regardless of the wishes, or even the rights, of the minority. It is the principle of tyrants, the principle that might makes right. It is the principle which protects the lion from the lamb; which grants concessions to the rich, who can take care of themselves, at the expense of the poor, who have not power to protest. It is the principle which directly contravenes the divine command: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." "This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish." *AMS May 1887, page 37.9*

But it is urged that Sunday is the day divinely appointed for rest, and that, therefore, the State in enforcing its observance, is compelling men simply to do what is right, and what they ought to do voluntarily. Well, suppose that men really ought to keep Sunday; here are some honest, conscientious men who cannot see it so; they read their Bibles carefully, and can see no command for Sunday observance, but think that they are plainly commanded to observe the seventh day. They cannot rest on Sunday without working on Saturday, and their conscience will not allow them to do that. If now the State steps in and says that they must, because it is right, the State becomes conscience for them, and Paul's declaration, "To his own Master he standeth or falleth," is ignored. And if the man submits in this, he becomes the worst kind of a slave. One may by force of circumstances yield his bodily strength to another, and still be a free man, but he who submits his conscience to another, parts with his manhood. We think no one who has a mind capable of deciding a case upon its merits, can deny the simple principles which are here laid down. They are in

harmony with the law of God and our own charter of liberty; and therefore they who seek to compel even a single individual to violate his conscience, proclaim themselves the enemies both of God and of man. E. J. W. *AMS May 1887, page 37.10*

July 1887

“A Little Comparison” American Sentinel 2, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of February 24 says:-*AMS July 1887, page 52.1*

“The constant struggle for place and self and power in American politics, closely resembles the struggles for the throne in the last days of the Roman Empire, and every thoughtful student of history must be struck by the correspondence.”*AMS July 1887, page 52.2*

Very true; and the thoughtful student of history will be struck by another correspondence which the *Statesman* forgot to mention. In the last days of the Roman Empire many professed Christians, whose zeal outran their piety, thought that politics would be vastly improved if only the church were placed under State patronage, and were allowed a controlling voice in public affairs. Accordingly Constantine did for the church just what the National Reform Association is trying to accomplish in these days. What he did, and its consequences, is thus told by Eugene Lawrence:-*AMS July 1887, page 52.3*

“In the last great persecution under Diocletian the bishops of Rome probably fled once more to the catacombs. Their churches were torn down, their property confiscated, their sacred writings destroyed, and a vigorous effort was made to extirpate the powerful sect. But the effort was vain. Constantine soon afterward became emperor, and the bishop of Rome emerged from the catacombs to become one of the ruling powers of the world. This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures; where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer Marcellinus. The church

was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishop drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna, and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot, and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the religion which he professed.*AMS July 1887, page 52.4*

“The bishopric of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud. The bishop was elected by the clergy and populace of the city, and this was the only elective office at Rome. Long deprived of all the rights of freemen, and obliged to accept the senators and consuls nominated by the emperors, the Romans seemed once more to have gained a new liberty in their privilege of choosing their bishop. They exercised their right with a violence and a factious spirit that showed them to be unworthy of possessing it. On the election day the streets of Rome were often filled with bloodshed and riot. The rival factions assailed each other with blows and weapons. Churches were garrisoned, stormed, sacked, and burned; and the opposing candidates, at the head of their respective parties, more than once asserted their spiritual claims by force of arms.”*AMS July 1887, page 52.5*

Much more might be given to the same effect. The struggle for place and power is not yet so openly shameless as it was in the days of Rome’s decline; but once let the church, as a church, enter into politics, and the climax will be reached. The lesson which the thoughtful student of history will draw from this, is that men cannot be converted by the forms of religion, and that if the State is controlled by unprincipled men, a union of Church and State will simply result in the church’s being controlled by the same wicked men. The unregenerated human nature that is in any man will make itself manifest whether he is in the church or out of it.*AMS July 1887, page 53.1*

E. J. W.

August 1887

“Convicted on Their Own Testimony” American Sentinel 2, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

A gentleman in Ohio, having received a copy of the SENTINEL, sent it to his pastor, requesting him to give his opinion of its sentiments. Accordingly the pastor writes to us, giving his objections to the teaching of the SENTINEL. As his objections and arguments have been answered time and again in these columns, it is not necessary to formally answer them here; but we will quote one paragraph from his letter. He says:-*AMS August 1887, page 57.1*

“I should say at the outset that we are both members of the National Reform Association, in opposition to which your paper seems to be published; and as for myself, I preach National Reform doctrine on all proper occasions. Moreover, we are both lineal descendants of men who, in the days of the tyrannical Stewarts, [*sic.*] contended for ‘Christ’s Crown and Covenant;’ and for that civil and religious liberty which makes it possible for you to publish the SENTINEL to-day. This being the case, it cannot be supposed that we are in favor of a ‘union of Church and State,’ which you so much fear, for this is the very thing which our fathers contended against even to the death.”*AMS August 1887, page 57.2*

The main point in this paragraph is the admission that the National Reform movement is identical with that of the Covenanters. This being the case, and it is the simple truth, it is easy to ascertain whether or not National Reform aims at union of Church and State, and how much religious liberty it stands for. We wish first, however, to call attention to the statement that the Covenanters contended for that civil and religious liberty which makes it possible for us to publish the SENTINEL to-day. Well, granting for the moment that that is true, what do the National Reformers want more? Since their movement is identical with that of the Covenanters, and we now have the liberty for which the Covenanters contended, what reason is there for the existence of the National Reform Association? Or do they want something else? Are they like the physician who, when

he found that his patient slept well, and had a good appetite and good digestion, said, "Well, we shall soon change all that." Let them answer. But it is not necessary for them to answer. Their boast that they are descendants, lineal or otherwise, of the Covenanters is sufficient answer. We are well assured that if National Reform principles were in force to-day, it would not be possible for us to publish another SENTINEL. Now for the proof.*AMS August 1887, page 57.3*

The Encyclopedia Britannica gives the following brief history of the Covenanters:-*AMS August 1887, page 57.4*

"Covenanters, in Scottish history, the name applied to a party embracing the great majority of the people, who during the seventeenth century bound themselves to establish and maintain the Presbyterian doctrine and polity, as the sole religion of the country, to the exclusion of Prelacy and Popery.... There were several successive covenants, similar in spirit and expression, the most important being the National Covenant of 1638 and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. These were both based upon earlier documents.... The Solemn League and Covenant was established in the year 1643, and formed a bond between Scotland, England, and Ireland for the united preservation of the Reformed religion in the church of Scotland, the reformation of religion in England and Ireland, according to the word of God and the example of the best Reformed churches, and the extirpation of Popery and Prelacy. It was sworn [to] and subscribed by many in both nations, approved by the Parliament and Assembly at Westminster, and ratified by the General Assembly of Scotland in 1645. King Charles I. disapproved of it when he surrendered himself to the Scottish army in 1646; but in 1650 Charles II. by a solemn oath declared his approbation both of this and of the National Covenant; and in August the same year he made a further declaration at Dunfermline to the same purpose, which was renewed on the occasion of his coronation at Scone in 1651. In the same year also *the Covenant was ratified by Parliament, and subscription to it required from every member*, -it being declared that without such subscription the constitution of the Parliament was null and void."-*Art. Covenanters. AMS August 1887, page 57.5*

Lest any should think that this is prejudiced testimony, we quote what W. G. Blakie says in the Schaff-Herzog Cyclopaedia. This is Presbyterian testimony. After speaking of the "Solemn League and Covenant," Blakie says:-*AMS August 1887, page 57.6*

"This Covenant, besides binding the subscribers to maintain the Reformed church, in its integrity, according to the word of God, pledged them 'to endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy (*i.e.*, church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and power of godliness, lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and his name one in the three kingdoms.'" *AMS August 1887, page 57.7*

Here we have Church and State union in the most narrow sense, the union of a denomination with the State. But this will appear still more plainly when we read the following exact copy of the "Covenant" above referred *AMS August 1887, page 57.8*

"ASSEMBLY AT EDINBURGH, AUGUST 30, 1639, SESSION 23."

"Act ordaining, by Ecclesiastical Authority, the Subscription of the Confession of faith and Covenant with the Assembly's Declaration." *AMS August 1887, page 58.1*

"The General Assembly considering the great happiness which may flow from a full and perfect union of this kirk and kingdom, by joining of all in one and the same covenant with God, with the King's Majesty, and amongst ourselves; having, by our great oath, declared the uprightness and loyalty of our intentions in all our proceedings; and having withal supplicated his Majesty's high Commissioner, and the Lords of his Majesty's honorable privy council, to enjoin, by act of council, all the lieges in time coming to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Covenant; which, as a testimony of our fidelity to God, and loyalty to our king, we have subscribed: And seeing his Majesty's high Commissioner, and the Lords of his Majesty's honorable privy council, have granted the desire of our supplication, ordaining, by civil authority, all his

Majesty's lieges, in time coming, to subscribe the foresaid Covenant: that our union may be the more full and perfect, we, by our act and constitution ecclesiastical, do approve the foresaid Covenant in all the heads and clauses thereof; and ordain of new, under all ecclesiastical censure. That all the masters of universities, colleges, and schools, all scholars at the passing of their degrees, all persons suspected of Papistry, or any other error; and finally, all the members of this kirk and kingdom, subscribe the same, with these words prefixed to their subscription. 'The Article of this Covenant, which was at the first subscription referred to the determination of the General Assembly, being determined; and thereby the five articles of Perth, the government of the kirk by bishops, the civil places and power of kirkmen, upon the reasons and grounds contained in the acts of the General Assembly, declared to be unlawful within this kirk; We subscribe according to the determination foresaid.' And ordain the Covenant, with this declaration, to be insert in the registers of the Assemblies of this kirk, general, provincial, and *presbyterial, ad perpetuam rei memoriam*. And in all humility supplicate his Majesty's high Commissioner, and the honorable Estates of Parliament, by their authority, to ratify and *enjoin the same, under all civil pains*; which will tend to the glory of God, preservation of religion, the King's Majesty's honor, and perfect peace of this kirk and kingdom." *AMS August 1887, page 58.2*

Notice that this act ordained "a *full and perfect union*" of the church and kingdom, and the suppression of error "under all civil pains." We cannot but smile when our friend tells how the Covenanters contended for liberty of conscience. They contended for liberty for themselves, that is true; but having obtained it, they were not content therewith, but must needs *force their liberty* upon everybody else! They reasoned, no doubt, that what suited them was good for everybody else, and if other people did not chance to think so, why then they ought, for the good of their own souls, to be *compelled* to accept the Covenanters' liberty of conscience. *AMS August 1887, page 58.3*

To show how completely the church ruled the State, we quote again from the Encyclopedia Britannica. After having described the manner by which the Act of 1639 was secured, the writer

says:-*AMS August 1887, page 58.4*

“The church was now secure. She had gained the day, because on this occasion the zeal of the ministers and the interests of the nobles had been both enlisted in her service. The victory had been won in her name, and the influence of her ministers was vastly increased. For the spiritual tyranny which they introduced, the reader should refer to Buckle’s famous chapter; or, if he think those statements to be partial or exaggerated, to original records, such as those of the presbyteries of St. Andrews and Cupar. The arrogance of the ministers’ pretensions, and the readiness with which these pretensions were granted, the appalling conceptions of the Deity which were inculcated, and the absence of all contrary expressions of opinion, the intrusion on the domain of the magistrate, the vexatious interference in every detail of family and commercial life, and the patience with which it was borne, are to an English reader alike amazing. ‘We acknowledge,’ said they, ‘that according to the latitude of the word of God (which is our theme) we are allowed to treat in an ecclesiastical way of greatest and smallest, from the king’s throne that should be established in righteousness, to the merchant’s balance that should be used in faithfulness.’ The liberality of the interpretation given to this can only be judged of after minute reading.”-*Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Presbyterianism.AMS August 1887, page 58.5*

It will not be denied that Buckle was not partial toward religion; yet since his statements are supported by the records, and he gives the authority for them all, no one can deny that he has written the truth. Accordingly we quote one paragraph from the “famous chapter” to which the Britannica refers.*AMS August 1887, page 58.6*

It will show the effect of the “full and perfect union” of that “kirk and kingdom.”-*AMS August 1887, page 58.7*

“According to the Presbyterian polity, which reached its height in the seventeenth century, the clergyman of the parish selected a certain number of laymen on whom he could depend, and who, under the name of elders, were his counselors, or rather the ministers of his authority. They, when assembled together, formed what was called the Kirk-session, and this little court, which enforced the decisions

uttered in the pulpit, was so supported by the superstitious reverence of the people, that it was far more powerful than any civil tribunal. By its aid the minister became supreme. For, whoever presumed to disobey him was excommunicated, was deprived of his property, and was believed to have incurred the penalty of eternal perdition. Against such weapons, in such a state of society, resistance was impossible. The clergy interfered with every man's private concerns, ordered how he should govern his family, and often took upon themselves the personal control of his household. Their minions, the elders, were everywhere; for each parish was divided into several quarters, and to each quarter one of these officials was allotted, in order that he might take special notice of what was done in his own district. Besides this, spies were previously appointed, so that nothing could escape their supervision. Not only the streets, but even private houses were searched, and ran-sacked, to see if anyone was absent from church while the minister was preaching. To him all must listen, and him all must obey. Without the consent of his tribunal, no person might engage himself either as a domestic servant, or as a field laborer. If anyone incurred the displeasure of the clergy, they did not scruple to summon his servants and force them to state whatever they knew respecting him, and whatever they had seen done in his house. To speak disrespectfully of a preacher was a grievous offense; to differ from him was a heresy; even to pass him in the streets without saluting him, was punished as a crime. His very name was regarded as sacred, and not to be taken in vain. And, that, it might be properly protected, and held in due honor, an Assembly of the church, in 1642, forbade it to be used in any public paper, unless the consent of the holy man had been previously obtained.”-*History of Civilization in England, Vol. 2, chap. 5*AMS August 1887, page 58.8

We who have never experienced of ecclesiastical supremacy, can scarcely believe that such a state of things could ever exist. Yet all know that under Papal supremacy the Inquisition carried on the most barbarous system of espionage, and why should we wonder that it could be done under Presbyterian supremacy. A Catholic is no worse by nature than a man of belief. The Catholics did not persecute because they were by nature worse than others, neither was it because their religious tenets were erroneous, but because

by their polity they were bound to enforce their religious tenets, right or wrong, upon everybody. If the Catholics were not bound by their superiors to carry their religion into politics, they would be just as good citizens as men of any other denomination. And when men of any or all denominations try to enforce their opinions, no matter how true those opinions may be, upon others, nothing but persecution can come. So the Covenanters contended against Catholic Popery, but established a Protestant Popery that was equally bad.*AMS August 1887, page 58.9*

We do not quote these things for the purpose of bringing Scotch Presbyterianism into disrepute, nor for the purpose of holding Covenanters up to scorn. We simply wish to show the inevitable result of a union, no matter what its nature, between religious bodies and the State. We know that the National Reformers say that they do not want a union of Church and State, but a union of religion and the State; but, as we have many times shown, this is a distinction without any difference. That was all the Covenanters wanted. It is sufficient at this time to remind the reader that there can be no religion where there are no people to profess religion. Religion cannot therefore be exhibited abstractly, but only in connection with some religious body. And so, when you have a union of religion and the State, you necessarily have a union of some religious body or bodies and the State.*AMS August 1887, page 58.10*

The last quotation we made showed the power which the ministers arrogated to themselves. The way in which this came about was very natural. They had been foremost in the fight against Catholic oppression, and thus were looked up to with great reverence as in a sense the saviours of the country. Then when freedom from Catholic rule was gained, they were loth to lay down the power which they had acquired, and which the people readily acknowledged. All history and experience show that when any man once gets power in his hands, he imagines that the people can never be so well off with that power in any other hands. So the Protestant clergy, believing that the religion which they professed was "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," and having the power in their hands, enforced their religion, even to the smallest minutia, upon the people.*AMS August 1887, page 58.11*

Now let it be remembered that the National Reform Association has set for its model the work of the Covenanters; that the leading National Reformers boast of their descent from the Covenanters; and that the liberty which was had under the "Covenant," is the liberty which they wish to establish in this country, and then decide whether such "liberty" is better than that which we now enjoy. That the National Reformers do expect to have a Protestant hierarchy, who shall rule with as much despotism as did the Covenanter clergy, or the priests of Rome, is evident from the following utterance of Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, one of the leading National Reformers:-*AMS August 1887, page 59.1*

"If our nation will accept God as the source of all authority, Christ Jesus as the nation's king, and his law as of supreme authority over them, its creed is orthodox. The theological questions referred to do not belong to the nation as a civil organism, nor to our movement, which is a civil and not an ecclesiastical one; *the churches must settle these questions* among themselves and with each other, and at least *we will not allow the civil Government* to decide between them, and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws."-*Christian Statesman, Feb. 21, 1884. AMS August 1887, page 59.2*

"We will not allow," etc. Nothing shall be enacted which we ministers do not approve. This is the language of ecclesiastical despotism. Plenty more might be given to the same effect, but this is sufficient to show that National Reform success means not only a union of Church and State, but a union with the State subordinate to the Church, and bound to carry out the commands of the clergy. That means "liberty of conscience"-to those who are in the ascendancy-but galling oppression to all dissenters. We know of no higher ground upon which we could base a request to the people of this country to support the AMERICAN SENTINEL, than that it is firmly set for the defense of the people against such "liberty" as the National Reform Association would give us. E. J. W*AMS August 1887, page 59.3*

September 1887

“A ‘Virtual Theocracy’ Promised” American Sentinel 2, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

It has been the aim of the SENTINEL, not only to set forth the principles that underlie the National Reform movement, and the loss of freedom that would follow its success, but also to arouse the people of this country to a sense of the fact that that movement has already acquired alarmingly large proportions. To this end we have repeatedly stated that the movement is by no means confined to the body of men called the National Reform Association. The Prohibition party and the Women’s Christian Temperance Union are fully committed to the movement, and these are endeavoring, with good prospects of success, to beguile the Knights of Labor into the movement. It is through the combined action of these various societies, as societies, and of the Protestant and Catholic Churches, as representing the Christianity of *America* (not of *Christ*, be it understood), that National Reform ideas will be made realities in this country. That National Reform ideas will prevail when these classes unite their forces, is too evident to call for proof.*AMS September 1887, page 66.1*

The Women’s Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association have been wedded, so that the aims of one party may be said to be the aims of the other. What the ultimate aim of both is, is incidentally revealed in the following, which is part of the last paragraph of an article by Miss Willard, in the *Chicago Advance* of June 30:-*AMS September 1887, page 66.2*

“We of this matchless epoch are preparing material for future orators, who, as they descant upon ‘the wonder that shall be,’ will point to these days of the saloon, the prize-fight, the trampled Sabbath, the grinding monopoly, the disfranchised womanhood, as a period of semi-barbarism from which they thank God for deliverance into the New Republic with its virtual theocracy and universal brotherhood in Christ.”*AMS September 1887, page 66.3*

Miss Willard is *the* spokesman of the Woman’s Christian

Temperance Union, so that the above may safely be taken as setting forth the aim of that association. Her statement is identical with that of the National Reformers themselves, who talk of the republic with Christ as its king. She confidently expects “a virtual theocracy” when these various “reform” associations and parties become consolidated, which she predicts will be in ‘92 or ‘96. Now “a virtual theocracy” is nothing more nor less than a union of Church and State, with some other name, and with the church element the controlling power in the union. National Reform evasions cannot conceal this.*AMS September 1887, page 66.4*

Such a state of things cannot fail to be followed by disastrous consequences. We care not by whom it is brought about, the result will be the same. We are not impugning the motives of the gifted ladies who compose the working force of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, nor would we be understood as being one whit behind anybody in our admiration of their efforts in behalf of true temperance. What we deprecate is the fact that they have thought to enlarge their sphere of usefulness to the extent of bringing about the millennium by National Reform methods. We have no notion of detailing in this place the evils that must result from any union of Church and State; what we want to emphasize is the fact that those evils will be none the less because the proposed union will in large measure be the work of so good people as the ladies of the W. C. T. U. If a child in its innocent play draws the live coals from the grate and scatters them upon the carpet, the effect will be just the same as though the coals were scattered by a malicious incendiary. So these good people may think that “a virtual theocracy” will be the best thing for this country, but that will not lessen the evil. We cherish the hope that some of them, at least, may see whither they are drifting, and may recover themselves. But, in view of the position of the leader of the powerful organization known as the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, will anyone who knows the evils of Church and State union, dare say that we are sounding an unnecessary alarm?*AMS September 1887, page 67.1*

E. J. W.

“Church and State” American Sentinel 2, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

EDITORS SENTINEL: In your last number I saw an article headed "Church and State," copied from the *San Francisco Chronicle*. I thought it erroneous as well as incorrect in its statements, and therefore wrote a short article to the *Chronicle* in reply. It was thrown into Mr. DeYoung's waste-basket. I am thankful to be assured by you that a brief and similar writing will not share the same fate by the editors of the SENTINEL. My statements must be brief, so I hope they will be accurate.*AMS September 1887, page 68.1*

1. I have been familiar with the National Reform movement from its first inception, and I think its object is not the union of Church and State either in form or in fact. No member of the association says it is; not one man in the association desires it; and the movement has no tendency towards it.*AMS September 1887, page 68.2*

2. If the movement and the National Reform Association are approved and indorsed by the Women's Christian Temperance Union as well as by leading ministers of most of "the evangelical denominations," as the "prominent clergyman," the informant of the *Chronicle* reporter, says, the movement is not presumably very dangerous. Miss Willard is not a very dangerous woman except in the estimation of the saloonists and such like. Neither she nor the ministers of the evangelical denominations desire a union of Church and State; and if the movement tends to it, surely they have sense enough to see it. The presumption, therefore, is that the SENTINEL'S fears are groundless.*AMS September 1887, page 68.3*

3. It is true that the National Reformers are opposed to the secular theory of Government, but it is not true that their avowed intention is to afford a basis of organic law "for the general enforcement of Sunday observance." The Reformers do not differ from the great mass of Protestant Christians all the world over. They all hold that in Christian lands the civil law should protect the people in their right to rest on the Christian Sabbath and to worship God without molestation by others. Neither National Reformers nor others dream of compelling men to observe the Sabbath religiously. They all

believe, however, that the State should be the conservator of morals; and they assume that the law of the fourth commandment is a moral law. And who that believes in Christianity at all does not know that if the Christian Sabbath should be abolished there would soon be neither religion nor Christian morality. Moral anarchy and chaos would result. The friends of the Sabbath, therefore, are the best friends of the nation and of the people.*AMS September 1887, page 68.4*

4. The “prominent clergyman” who answered the *Chronicle* reporter’s question, “Which one of the religious denominations takes the lead in this movement” shows that he knows little about it. He should post himself before he presumes to post others through the secular press. Rev. Dr. Gibson of San Francisco, is not to be one of the vice-presidents. I presume he never was at a National Reform meeting, and never spoke in public or preached in favor of it. He does not even take the *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the association. And the statement that it is Dr. Gibson’s “intention, on his return from Europe, to organize a state branch in California,” etc., will, no doubt, be news to himself. Indeed, I do not know that there is a minister in San Francisco, and almost none in Oakland, who has ever written or spoken a word in favor of the special object of the National Reform Association. So that manifestly the *Chronicle*’s “prominent clergyman” is an alarmist who himself needs to be instructed. And I am sorry that the SENTINEL borrows trouble from the *Chronicle*.*AMS September 1887, page 68.5*

5. That a wine and liquor paper, such as the San Francisco *Chronicle*, should like to make capital against the Prohibition party by arraying them with the National Reform movement, might be expected. But that the SENTINEL should endorse the *Chronicle* in such an effort seems strange to one who knows that the editors of the SENTINEL are the fast friends of temperance, and presumably of prohibition also.*AMS September 1887, page 68.6*

6. General Grant never opposed National Reform nor the Amendment advocated. In his Des Moines speech he spoke what may have displeased Roman Catholics, who influence in the State he feared; but it is unfair to array him and Sumner and Andrews as opposed to the Reform so feared by the SENTINEL. On the

contrary, Senator Charles Sumner, in the early years of the movement gave public testimony in favor of it. That they all opposed a union of Church and State is presumed, but it does not follow that they opposed National Reform. So far as they knew the value of Christianity, so far they knew that "righteousness exalts a nation." *AMS September 1887, page 68.7*

A REFORMER.

The above communication is from one for whom we entertain sincere respect, and for this reason, as well as because the SENTINEL can afford to be more than fair, we give it a place in our columns. We have no desire except for truth; and if anything that anyone could write would overthrow any of the positions which the SENTINEL has taken, we would publish it as willingly as we did those positions. But although we have unbounded confidence in our correspondent's honesty, we think he is not so well informed on the question of National Reform as we are, and we shall therefore review his statements *seriatim*. *AMS September 1887, page 68.8*

1. Positive argument would be much more conclusive than our friend's modest disclaimer. He thinks that the object of National Reform is not the union of Church and State; we *know* that its object is the union of Church and State, to the fullest extent that such a union ever existed. We say we know this, and so we do, if we may believe the statements of those who seem to be at the head of the movement. It is true that no member of the association says that a union of Church and State is the object of the movement; on the contrary, they emphatically declare that it is not; but at the same time they most urgently demand a condition of things which would be nothing else. It is possible that they do not know what would constitute a union of Church and State, and imagine that if they give some other name to that which they are working for, no evil results will follow. But we care not for names; the mere name of Church and State union can do no harm, but the thing itself can, by whatever name it is called. *AMS September 1887, page 68.9*

To show that we have reason for saying that we *know* that the National Reform movement does design a practical union of Church

and State, we re-quote the following specimen statements made by prominent National Reformers, and published in the official organs of that association:-*AMS September 1887, page 69.1*

In the *Christian Statesman*, in March, 1884, Rev. J. W. Foster said, among other things:-*AMS September 1887, page 69.2*

“According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for and to serve the purpose of the church;” and again he affirms that in the ideal National Reform State, “The expenses of the church in carrying on her public, aggressive work, it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury.” This means the taxation of the people to support the church as a branch of the government. How a more complete union of Church and State could be made, we cannot imagine. And right in harmony with Mr. Foster’s statements, but far more explicit, is the following from the *Christian Nation*, July 14, 1886:-*AMS September 1887, page 69.3*

“It is the duty of civil rulers, in subordination to Christ, to recognize the church, its ordinances, and its laws. It is not merely that the existence of such an organization is owned and tolerated, but a statutory arrangement, confessing the divine origin of the church, and the divine obligation resting on the nation to accept its doctrine and order, and engaging to regulate their administration in conformity with its constitution and object.”*AMS September 1887, page 69.4*

In the same article we read:-*AMS September 1887, page 69.5*

“Civil rulers owe it to their supreme Lord and to society to encourage and to stimulate the church in its work of faith and labor of love, and, when it may be necessary, to give pecuniary aid to its ministers, that the gospel may be preached in every part of their dominions, and to all classes without respect of persons.”*AMS September 1887, page 69.6*

And then the writer proceeds to say that there would be no injustice, but that it would be perfectly right, “to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed.” That is, it is right according to the National Reform idea of right, which idea

seems to be that everything that the majority may do is right, if the majority chance to be National Reformers, and that the minority have no rights of any kind.*AMS September 1887, page 69.7*

These statements were not made in the heat of debate, but are part of a sermon written by Wm. Sommerville, of Nova Scotia, and after his death edited from the original manuscript by Rev. R. M. Sommerville, of New York, and then published in one of the organs of the National Reform Association. So we must take them as the sentiments of that association.*AMS September 1887, page 69.8*

We might multiply quotations to the same effect, from leading National Reformers, but it is not necessary in this connection. If National Reformers do not believe in nor desire a union of Church and State, and if they wish to set themselves right in this matter, they may publish in the columns of the SENTINEL a repudiation of these and other quotations which we have made from their leading men. So long as such sentiments are expressed, however, it is useless for them to say that they do not want a union of Church and State.*AMS September 1887, page 69.9*

2. It does not necessarily follow that because there are good and able men in the National Reform Association, and because the movement is indorsed by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, it cannot be dangerous. Our correspondent would evidently have us believe that a good or an honest man, or even a wise man, cannot be mistaken or blinded by feeling or prejudice. We are perfectly willing to admit that very many (we cannot include all) National Reformers are sincere in their motives, and desire only good for the people of this country; but that by no means proves that they have chosen the true way to accomplish the good that they desire. Whether or not Miss Willard is a dangerous woman, depends upon how she uses her vast influence. If she uses it to help the majority to put a yoke upon the consciences of the minority, then she is dangerous, no matter how upright her intentions may be. A little child is not a very dangerous creature, nevertheless a match which it may ignite in its innocent play, may cause as great a conflagration as a match in the hands of a hardened incendiary. Honesty of purpose may secure to a person immunity from punishment for an imprudent act, but it cannot ward

off the evil consequences of such an act.*AMS September 1887, page 69.10*

3. When our friend says, "It is true that the National Reformers are opposed to the secular theory of government," he virtually admits that they do desire a union of Church and State. The opposite of the secular theory of government is the ecclesiastical theory, which National Reformers favor. So then his disclaimer amounts to this: National Reformers do not desire a union of Church and State; they simply want an ecclesiastical government.*AMS September 1887, page 69.11*

It is mere nonsense to say or to imply that what the National Reformers want is that "the civil law should protect the people in their right to rest on the 'Christian Sabbath,' and to worship God without molestation of others," for the civil law does that already. There is no law in the United States that would compel a man to work on Sunday, or that would for a moment uphold any man or any set of men in attempting to force anyone to do so. More than this, the laws do protect all religious bodies in their right to worship God without molestation by others. If any religious congregation in any city in the United States should be molested in their worship, whether on Sunday or any other day of the week, the intruder would be landed in jail as soon as a policeman could be summoned, and he would be very fortunate if he did not receive the severest penalty. Our laws do at the present time protect *all* people in their worship; but they do not compel those who have no religious convictions to conform to the practice of those who do, and they will not do so until National Reform principles shall prevail.*AMS September 1887, page 69.12*

Again our friend says: "They all believe that the State should be the conservator of morals." "They" may believe it, but we do not. The person who thinks that the State can act as the conservator of morals has either a supremely exalted idea of the power of the State, or an extremely low standard of morality, or else he has not really given the subject any careful thought. It will not be questioned but that the ten commandments contain the sum of all moral duties. Then if the State is the conservator of morals, it must see that every one of the ten commandments is obeyed by its citizens. As a matter

of fact, however, the State can do nothing of the kind, no matter how virtuous its law-makers are, nor how just its judges. Let us consider an instance or two.*AMS September 1887, page 69.13*

The tenth commandment says, "Thou shalt not covet." Will any National Reformer claim that it is the duty of the State to keep a man from being covetous? or that it is within the province of the State to punish a man for covetousness? The thing is an impossibility. The State has no power, in the first place, even to determine whether or not a man is covetous. But covetousness is immoral; therefore in this respect the State cannot be a conservator of morals.*AMS September 1887, page 69.14*

Again, the Bible tells us that "covetousness is idolatry." Now while the State has the power, although not the right, to restrain men from falling down before images, it cannot prevent their being at heart the grossest kind of idolaters. And who shall say that in the eyes of the only Judge of morals, the ignorant image worshiper is more immoral than the scheming, covetous Pharisee?*AMS September 1887, page 69.15*

Take for instance those commandments in regard to which the State has a certain duty. The sixth commandment says, "Thou shalt not kill." It is the duty of the State to prevent murder as far as possible, by executing severe penalties upon those who take human life. But we are told in the Scriptures that he who gives way to unreasoning anger, or who secretly cherishes hatred and envy in his heart, is a murderer. With this, the State can do nothing. Is the man who takes the life of another in the heat of passion, and possibly after great provocation, any more immoral than the one who for days and perhaps years cherishes murder in his heart, perhaps longing for a chance to commit it, and only deterred by lack of opportunity? Everybody will answer in the negative. Yet the State executes the first and pays no attention to the second. Why? Because the first has interfered with the rights of society, while the second, although probably more depraved, has injured no one but himself. The first has committed an uncivil act, which is also immoral, and comes in collision with the civil law, which punishes him, not for his immoral, and comes in collision with the civil law, which punishes him, not for his immorality, but for his uncivility;

while the second, although basely immoral, and violated no civil law, and is therefore not answerable to the State.*AMS September 1887, page 69.16*

The seventh commandment says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." It is within the province of the State to punish the man who openly commits adultery with his neighbor's wife; yet that man may not be half so corrupt as another one whose every thought is impure, and whose soul is rotten with meditated vice which he has not the power or the courage to openly practice, yet upon whom the State can lay no hand, because he has invaded no household. Then let no one say that the State is or ever can be the conservator of morals. All it can do, and all it is appointed to do, is to punish those whose unrestrained vices interfere with the rights of society.*AMS September 1887, page 70.1*

The very expressions "civil laws" and "civil government" define the extent of the State's jurisdiction. As to the morals of the people, it is impossible for it to take cognizance of them, even if the right to do so were given it. The State may overstep her prerogatives, and enforce the customs and ceremonies of religion, but in so doing it will be making hypocrites, and will seriously interfere with the work of the gospel, by making men believe themselves to be moral, and in no need of conversion, although they may be, in reality, as corrupt as the inhabitants of Sodom.*AMS September 1887, page 70.2*

4. As to Dr. Gibson, it is a matter of very small moment whether he is personally connected with the National Reform Association or not. If the *Chronicle* reporter was misinformed, that ends that matter, but does not affect the main question in the least.*AMS September 1887, page 70.3*

5. The SENTINEL has never sought to make capital against the W. C. T. U. or the Prohibition party by arraying them with the National Reform movement, although we are sure, as our correspondent tacitly admits, that it is to their discredit that they are so arrayed. It should be understood that the SENTINEL deals first, last, and all the time with the National Reform Association, and has no crusade to make against any other association. As a matter of fact, the

SENTINEL is heartily in favor of the W. C. T. U. as far as it adheres to its legitimate temperance work, and we have mentioned that organization only to show how rapidly the current is setting toward National Reform principles. We regard it as a great calamity that an organization with such power for good as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union should lend itself, however innocently, to the furtherance of National Reform designs. When the W. C. T. U. does this, then to that extent it necessarily brings itself into the same condemnation as the National Reform Association.*AMS September 1887, page 70.4*

6. We have not the data at hand to verify or disprove the statement made concerning the attitude of Grant, Sumner, and Andrews toward National Reform, and it is of little consequence anyway. It matters not how certain men, no matter how great, have regarded this question. We are discussing the case on its own merits, and if the National Reform movement is intrinsically wrong, as we believe it is, it cannot be bettered by the adherence of any number of eminent men. We do not borrow trouble from the Chronicle nor from any other source. There will be no necessity for any lover of justice to borrow trouble so long as the National Reform Association exists. We speak the things which we know, and do not take our information at second hand. We consider it our duty, however, to let our readers know how other journals regard the movement which the SENTINEL is combating; but in giving their opinions we do not necessarily become responsible for all their statements. That the SENTINEL'S charges against the movement are incontrovertible is evidenced, we think, to some extent by the fact that not a single National Reformer has ever attempted to demonstrate the fallacy of one of them. E. J. W.*AMS September 1887, page 70.5*

October 1887

“Not ‘A Daniel Come to Judgment’” *American Sentinel* 2, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The State of Louisiana has, in common with many other States, been doctoring its Sunday laws, and now has a law requiring that, with certain exceptions, all places of business shall be closed from 12 o'clock on Saturday night until 12 o'clock on Sunday night. A case recently came before the Supreme Court of Louisiana, in which the law was claimed to be unconstitutional. The court held the law to be valid, and the following is a portion of the opinion delivered by the Judge:-*AMS October 1887, page 75.1*

“We take occasion promptly to say that if the object of the law were to compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, we would not hesitate to declare it to be violative of the above constitutional prohibition. It would violate equally the religious liberty of the Christian, the Jew, and the infidel, none of whom can be compelled by law to comply with any merely religious observance whether it accords with his faith and con-science or not. With rare exceptions, the American authorities concur in this view.... The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned, because in the exercise of a wise discretion, it has chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this State, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observe as a day of rest.”*AMS October 1887, page 75.2*

The New York *Independent* quotes this, and adds the following words of approval:-*AMS October 1887, page 75.3*

“This is an exceeding lucid statement of the theory which underlies all legislation that requires the suspension of ordinary labor on Sunday. The object is not to enforce religious observances of any kind, but simply to establish a uniform day of rest for the general good of the whole people; and this is no interference with the religious rights of anybody.”*AMS October 1887, page 75.4*

It may seem very presumptuous for a non-professional man to criticise the opinion of so great a person as a Judge of a Supreme Court, but nevertheless we have no hesitation in saying that the opinion quoted is nothing but sophistry, and such sophistry as could be dealt out only by an adept in the art. This we think can easily be made apparent; and it is the more necessary that this should be done, because the Sunday-law mania has now become quite prevalent, and just such sophistical arguments as those quoted above will be relied on in securing the enactment of those laws. These arguments will be used for the reason that they are the best that can be offered in favor of an unjust law, and also simply because they have been used before. Even the Louisiana judge himself did not pretend to originate them, but contented himself with giving the view in which nearly all "American authorities concur." If American legal business were not becoming more a matter of precedent than of common sense, Sunday laws could never be enacted; but the idea seems to be that whatever has been done ought to be done; and precedents for oppressing people under the guise of charity are not wanting.*AMS October 1887, page 75.5*

The claim is made that the Sunday law does not compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, and that therefore it cannot be contrary to a Constitution which forbids religious tests for office or citizenship. But the fact is, Sunday is primarily a religious institution, and its observance cannot be enforced except as such. It cannot be separated from its religious (not sacred) character for the purpose of special legislation concerning it. It matters not what such legislation is called, whether a police regulation, or a law in the interests of the workingman, it is legislation concerning an institution of the church.*AMS October 1887, page 75.6*

To make it evident that Sunday laws are laws in behalf of religion, three things only need to be borne in mind: 1. Sunday rest originated in the church. Catholics universally claim the church as the sole authority for Sunday observance, and many Protestants agree with them in this. The *Christian at Work* says: "We rest the designation of Sunday solely on the church having set it apart of its own authority." But if the claims of those who say that Christ and the apostles set the day apart as a day of rest, were true, that would make it emphatically a church institution. 2. The observance of

Sunday is generally considered by church people as the essence of religion. In the Sunday-law contest in California five years ago, the *Christian Advocate* spoke of Sunday as “the foundation of our holy religion.” Regarding Sunday rest as the memorial of the resurrection of Christ, they think that without it there would be no evidence of the truth of the gospel. 3. The churches and the churches alone are at the bottom of all Sunday legislation. No one ever heard of such a thing as 1 Sunday law being proposed by anybody except a zealous churchman or a deputation of ministers. It is true that, by pretending that Sunday laws are in the interest of labor, they are inducing labor and socialistic organizations to clamor for such laws, but these organizations come in only as allies to the church. Everyone who knows anything of the history of Sunday legislation, knows that it is always instigated by the churches.*AMS October 1887, page 75.7*

Now in the face of these things, to say that Sunday laws do not compel men to observe Sunday as a religious institution, is not only sophistry, but it is positive untruth. Since the day as a day of rest is nothing else but a religious institution, how can it be enforced as anything else but a religious institution? It cannot be enforced as something which it is not. True, it is said that when the State enforces the observance of Sunday, it makes it a civil institution, merely a legal holiday. Well, nobody contends that the State law makes Sunday a religious institution; it is that already. We freely admit that the State law in its behalf is only a civil ordinance, for the State could make nothing else but a civil ordinance; but, mark it well, what we do claim, and what all candid minds must admit to be the truth, is that a State Sunday law is a civil ordinance enforcing the observance of a religious institution.*AMS October 1887, page 75.8*

Some years ago the city of San Francisco had a notorious mayor, who engaged in certain transactions that were inconsistent with his official position. His defense was that he did those things as an ordinary citizen, and not as mayor. It requires no argument to show the absurdity of such a statement. The man was mayor, and he could not separate himself from his office within the time for which he was elected. But this is just on a par with the argument that Sunday legislation is not the enforcement of a religious institution. If

the friends of so-called National Reform admit such a plea, they must be prepared to see it carried out to its legitimate conclusion. They must expect to see the vilest fakes elected to office in their model government, under the plea that they are not bad citizens, but are simply bad men.*AMS October 1887, page 76.1*

If anything further were needed to show the flimsy character of the arguments by which Sunday-law advocates attempt to make it appear that they are not working for an ecclesiastical establishment, it may be found in the last sentence of the judicial opinion first quoted. Said the judge:-*AMS October 1887, page 76.2*

“The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned because, in the exercise of a wise discretion, it has chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this State, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observe as a day of rest.”*AMS October 1887, page 76.3*

“A wise discretion,” indeed! The State has chosen the day which a large majority of its inhabitants, under the sanctions of their religious; faith, voluntarily observe as a day of rest, and, at the instigation of that majority, has undertaken to enforce its observance as a day of rest, and yet this is no more in the interest of religion than if Monday or Thursday had been chosen! Such a monstrous assertion needs but to be quoted to be refuted. A man must be sadly blinded to put such a statement forth as a sober legal argument; and men must be pre-determined to have Sunday laws, or they could not be deceived by it. Suppose that the State had, in the exercise of its “wise discretion,” chosen Saturday instead of Sunday; would there not have been protests without number? Indeed there would. People would call it a law in the interests of the Jews and other Sabbatarians, and no argument could convince them to the contrary. “But” says one, “such a law would really be unjust to the great majority who observe Sunday as a day of religious rest.” Indeed! Then by the same token a law enforcing Sunday observance is unjust to those who observe Saturday, or who do not choose to observe any set day. The discriminating reader can see that it is the word “majority” which catches the judicial fancy. It seems to be the idea that Sunday legislation cannot

be wrong, because the majority favor it. As much as to say that a thing is necessarily right if it is proposed by a majority of the people. But no majorities can ever make a wrong right, and State laws in behalf of an establishment of religion are always wrong. The question whether or not Sunday ought to be observed as a day of rest, does not enter into the case at all. We believe in the God of the Bible, as the majority of people in this country profess to do, but we should emphatically protest against a State law to compel all people to recognize him as such.*AMS October 1887, page 76.4*

Here is a point that should not be lost sight of: If Sunday laws are not for the purpose of compelling the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, for what purpose are they? The claim is that they are in the interest of humanity, so that laboring men may have the rest which their physical nature imperatively demands. Very well, then we suppose it will be admitted that it is within the province of the State to compel men to observe the laws of their being. Now it is just as certain that man's physical nature requires that he should take a definite amount of sleep every twenty-four hours, far more imperatively than it demands that he shall rest one day in seven. Will our Sunday-law friends admit that the State has any right to decide how many hours a man ought to sleep, and to enact a law compelling every man to sleep at least seven hours out of every twenty-four? Unless they are ready to advocate such a measure as this, let them say nothing more about enforcing Sunday rest on the basis of the necessity of man's physical nature. We have presented this view of the case before, but we do not expect ever to see Sunday-law advocates attempt to meet it.*AMS October 1887, page 76.5*

Now one word concerning the *Independent's* statement that Sunday legislation "is no interference with the religious rights of anybody." We say that it is a positive and unjust interference with the religious rights of everybody who conscientiously observes any day other than Sunday. Here are laboring men who believe that when the fourth commandment says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," it means just what it says. They are conscientious in their observance of the seventh day of the week; and the needs of their families demand that they should spend the other six days in labor, as the commandment

allows. According to the fourth commandment, it is their religious privilege to labor six days of the week, just as much as it is their religious duty to rest on the seventh. Therefore if the State steps in and compels them to rest on another day also, no matter on what grounds the rest is enforced, their religious rights are interfered with. And if those men shall be punished for continuing to make Sunday one of their six working days, their punishment will be an act of religious persecution. No assertions to the contrary can change the trust of this.*AMS October 1887, page 76.6*

From the very nature of the case, Sunday legislation must interfere with the religious rights of some. For, Sunday as a day of rest is beyond dispute a religious institution; legislation enforcing its observance is legislation enforcing an establishment of religion; and when any religious tenet is enforced, the religious rights of all who do not hold that tenet must be interfered with, and oppression must result.*AMS October 1887, page 76.7*

We hope that the people in those States that still allow full liberty of conscience, will take the time and trouble now to become well informed concerning the arguments used in behalf of Sunday laws, and will learn how to expose their fallacy, so that when the Sunday-law mania shall seize their State, as it surely will, they will not allow their liberty to be taken away without making a well-directed intelligent protest. E. J. W.*AMS October 1887, page 76.8*

November 1887

“The Bible in the Public Schools” American Sentinel 2, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

In the June number of the SENTINEL there was an article in which the following sentence occurred: “To shut the Bible and religious instruction out of the public school seems, to some people, to be a sacrilegious proceeding; but to maintain them in the public schools is not only very difficult, but very hazardous.” To this statement a good friend of the SENTINEL, took exception, thinking that it argued a lack of appreciation of the Bible. Although our private explanation of the matter was satisfactory to him, we propose to consider the subject somewhat in detail, for the benefit of others who may think that loyalty to the word of God demands that its study be maintained in the public schools.*AMS November 1887, page 83.1*

In the first place we will say that we yield to none in reverence for the Bible. We believe it to be the inspired word of God, and that it is “true from the beginning.” As an educator it is invaluable. We believe that if the Bible is rightly studied, a man can get a better education from it alone than from any other book that was ever printed. He would have a better disciplined mind and would be better fitted for society and business, that he could be by studying any other book ever written. Take all the eulogies of the Bible that have ever been written or spoken, and it may still be said that “the half has not been told.” And still we hold that it is a great mistake for Christians to insist upon the Bible being used as a text-book in the public schools. Our reasons are these:-*AMS November 1887, page 83.2*

The Bible is not an ordinary text-book. It is not a book to be studied as an arithmetic, beginning at the first page and mastering it point by point until the end is reached. It is not a book of logic, nor a book of science, although it is logical, and is scientifically exact, and is the basis of all true science: But it is primarily and solely a book of morals. It is true that there is no other book in the world the study of which will so admirably discipline the mind as will the Bible; and it is for this reason that many think the Bible should be used as a text-

book in the public schools. But such ones forget that the disciplinary effects of the Bible are not obtained when it is studied for that purpose alone, as people study geometry or read the orations of Cicero, but that the discipline of mind from the study of the Bible comes only when it is studied with a view of carrying out its precepts in the daily life.*AMS November 1887, page 83.3*

Proof of this is found in the following texts: *Psalms 111:10*: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have all they that do his commandments." *Deuteronomy 4:5, 6*: "Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. *Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations*, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." The Bible is like no other book that was ever written. Its language is simple and may be understood by the common people, yet it withholds its treasure from the most learned if they do not study it with reverent hearts. The one who studies it with no thought of its value as an educator of the mind, but solely to know what is the will of God, will find his mind expanded so that he can better comprehend affairs of every-day life; while the one who attempts to study it in the same manner and with the same spirit as he would study some secular author, will not derive any material benefit.*AMS November 1887, page 83.4*

The sum of all this is, that the Bible is a book whose sole object is to teach men the true religion, the religion of Jesus Christ. Now what is the public school? It is an invitation of the State and all those connected with the public-school system are in the employ of the civil government. They are, if you please, officers of the State. Therefore if the Bible be taught in the public schools, it will be simply the State teaching religion. The State will have to determine what views of the Bible shall be taught; for, let it be remembered, the Bible is not like mathematics, which is a fixed science, and concerning which there cannot possibly be a difference of opinion; but it affords opportunity for much variety of opinion. This is not because the Bible is so obscure that people cannot see alike, but because God has ordained that man shall be a free agent in matters of morals. And here is where the danger comes in, for if the

Bible be taught in the public schools, it must be taught in accordance with some system, and whatever theories may be taught, somebody's conscience is sure to be outraged.*AMS November 1887, page 84.1*

For example, there are many sincere Christians who believe that immersion is the only true baptism, while others conscientiously hold that sprinkling is baptism, and that infants should receive the ordinance. Most people believe that man has the principle of immortality by nature, while many believe that immortality is given only to those who believe in Christ, and they hold that any contrary teaching robs Christ of his chief glory. One person believes in the perpetuity and universal obligation of the ten commandments, while another believes that they were only for the Jews, and are now abolished. One man is a Unitarian and his neighbor is a Trinitarian, and so on. It is not within our province to say which of these views are right and which are wrong. It is sufficient that each one believes his own view to be the correct one, and does not wish to have his children taught a contrary view; neither does he wish to have the money which he pays as taxes to support the school, used in propagating doctrines which he holds to be vital errors.*AMS November 1887, page 84.2*

So we say that Christians themselves should not merely refrain from insisting that the Bible be used in the public schools, but should rather insist that it be kept out. There is indeed danger in having it placed there, for when that is done somebody's religious convictions are sure to be trampled upon. It is of the very essence of Church and State union to have the Bible taught in the public schools, for that would be nothing else but the State teaching religion; and the standard of the religion taught would be the opinions of the majority. Let each professed Christian who thinks that it is little less than sacrilege to say that the Bible ought not to be taught in the public schools, consider the matter seriously. He will find that what he wants and expects is that his views of the Bible shall be taught. But he has no warrant that this will be the case. It will not be the case unless he chances to be among the majority, and in that case he is helping to outrage the conscience of some other man. The simple fact is this: If the State adopts the Bible as a text-book in its schools, then it must decide how it shall be taught,

or, in other words, must fix a standard of religion.*AMS November 1887, page 84.3*

But suppose that all Christians were agreed concerning the principal points of Bible doctrines; they are not the ones who are to be considered. The public schools are for the public, and among the people there will be many who do not accept the Bible at all. What shall be done in their case? Here is the answer that Pastor Joshua Denovan gives in an article on, "The Bible in the Public Schools," which appeared in the *Faithful Witness*, of Toronto, Canada:-*AMS November 1887, page 84.4*

"Some advanced champions for freedom of conscience and the rights of man, in Britain and the United States, can't be accommodated. In this category must be classed agnostics, atheists, and scientific infidels. For my part, without hesitation or apology, I deny such men any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions and privileges at all."*AMS November 1887, page 84.5*

And again, speaking of the consciences of such men, he says: "Such consciences are peculiar-abnormally unique-and their owners must suffer for conscience' sake."*AMS November 1887, page 84.6*

The *Christian Statesman* of July 7, 1887, contains a reprint of the article in which these words occur, and the editor called special attention to it as a "masterly article." Such sentiments are in keeping with National Reform ideas of the gospel, but they are as different from the gospel of Jesus Christ as night is from day. The gospel knows nothing of compulsion; "*Whosoever will*, let him come," is its gracious call. The use of force in connection with matters of religion was conceived and is fostered only by the prince of darkness, "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." An infidel is a man, and, as such, he is entitled to the same rights and privileges in a human ("belonging to man or mankind") government that his Christian neighbor is, who is only a man. He may be and should be invited and urged to accept the Bible as the revealed will of his Creator, but so long as it would be wrong to compel a Christian to help support schools which should teach views of the Bible which he cannot conscientiously adopt, so long will it be wrong to compel

unbelievers to support schools for the teaching of religion.*AMS November 1887, page 84.7*

How, then, can the youth of Christian parents receive the Biblical instruction which their parents desire them to have? Let their parents instruct them at home, as is their duty. To the parent, and to the parent alone, has God instructed the moral and religious instruction of children. The divine command is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." *Deuteronomy 6:5-7.AMS November 1887, page 84.8*

If any number of parents who are of the same faith wish to send their children to a school where they can study the Bible to better advantage than they can at home, they may combine and form a denominational school, which is independent of State patronage, and to the support of which none need contribute except those who believe in the principles taught. Such schools are on the same footing as the various religious denominations themselves. The religious instruction is private, because it is supported by the private, voluntary contributions of those who favor the views taught by any given denomination; it is public only in the sense that anybody who wishes is privileged to come. This is all that anybody should desire; whatsoever is more than this, cometh of evil.*AMS November 1887, page 84.9*

E. J. W.

December 1887

“An Examine of Principles” American Sentinel 2, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The columns of the AMERICAN SENTINEL have often contained quotations from the speeches and writings of National Reformers, which have thrown light upon the aims of the National Reform Association. Although none of the statements quoted, some of which are very damaging to the claim for innocence and piety which the Association makes, have been disavowed by the organs of that Association, it is possible that some may think that the persons giving utterance to them are not qualified to speak for the Association. Accordingly we have concluded to go to the fountain-head of authority, and set before our readers just what National Reform, so-called, is, as set forth in its own constitution. Following is the preamble:-*AMS December 1887, page 89.1*

“Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of Nations, and that the revealed Will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs;*AMS December 1887, page 89.2*

“Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established;*AMS December 1887, page 89.3*

“Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath, Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion;*AMS December 1887, page 89.4*

“Viewing with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and the disregard of moral and religious character in those who are exalted to high places in the

nation;*AMS December 1887, page 89.5*

“Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government;*AMS December 1887, page 89.6*

“We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves,” etc.*AMS December 1887, page 89.7*

The *object* of the Association is given in the second article of the Constitution as follows”-*AMS December 1887, page 89.8*

“The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed Reforms in the action of the Government; touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation’s allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.”*AMS December 1887, page 89.9*

This preamble and constitution stands in every issue of the Statesman, and is the document to which National Reformers point with pride as showing the justness of the work in which they are engaged. We propose to examine these articles in detail:-*AMS December 1887, page 89.10*

1. The first statement, namely, “that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government,” may be true or false according as it is interpreted. If it be interpreted to mean that God has ordained that there be civil government among men, or that he himself exercises overruling power, or, as Daniel says, “removeth kings and setteth up kings,” we accept it as true. But if it be interpreted to mean that all civil authority. comes direct from God,

and that he him-self directs and controls civil government, then it is manifestly untrue. Every nation on the earth has a civil government, but there is no nation on earth of which God is direct ruler, nor has there been any such nation since the children of Israel rejected God by choosing a king for themselves. It is a fact, as Paul says, that “the powers that be are ordained of God;” but it should be remembered that this does not mean that they are necessarily ordained as God’s deputies in the moral government of the world, but that it means simply that government in general is in accordance with God’s design. Proof of this is found in the fact that when Paul wrote these words, pagan Rome was mistress of the world, and the Emperor Nero, who represented that greatest of all earthly Governments, was the very embodiment of wickedness and cruelty. Yet even the Roman Empire governed by the infamous Nero, was better than anarchy.*AMS December 1887, page 89.11*

If it were true that God is the civil governor of this world, then there would be only one form of government. But the statement that “the powers that be are ordained of God” is universally true. It is as true of the Government of England as of that of the United States, and of the Government of Germany and Russia as of that of either of the other countries. All civil authority comes from God; that is, neither emperors, kings, presidents, or councils would have any authority to execute penalty upon the evil-doer, if God had not ordained that civil government should exist among men. But the very statement that God “is the source of all power and authority in civil government,” even though given the broadest construction that National Reformers can put upon it, shows that the authority of the officers of the State is limited to civil affairs. The word “civil” is from the Latin *civis*, a citizen, and has reference solely to the relations *to one another*, of citizens of a State. Civil government is simply the guiding and regulating of the relations of men to one another, and has no reference to their special duties to God. It is charged with the duty of seeing that, so far as outward acts are concerned, men obey the injunction, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” Beyond this it has no right nor power.*AMS December 1887, page 89.12*

2. With the second statement, namely, that “the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations,” we take direct issue. We have no hesitation

whatever in pronouncing this to be false, because it is contrary to the Scriptures. Out of the abundance of scriptural proof on this point, we shall at present refer to only the following:-*AMS December 1887, page 90.1*

(a) Christ is now acting as priest and not as king. *Hebrews 8:1*. He is sitting at the right hand of God, but it is as “a priest upon his throne.” *Zechariah 6:13*. His work now is that of an intercessor (*Hebrews 7:25; 9:24*), and he has no other office.*AMS December 1887, page 90.2*

(b) Christ himself likened his going to Heaven and returning again, to a nobleman that “went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return,” and who after a time “returned having received the kingdom.” *Luke 19:11-15*.*AMS December 1887, page 90.3*

(c) God the Father is represented by the prophet David as saying to Christ, “Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.” *Psalms 110:1*. And Peter (*Acts 2:34-36*) makes application of this to the present time, when Christ is sitting at the right hand of God. If he were now the ruler of nations, he would not expect anybody else to make his foes his footstool. They would either be his footstool already, or else he would reduce them by his own power.*AMS December 1887, page 90.4*

It is true that Jesus said, just before he ascended to Heaven, “All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth” (*Matthew 28:18*); but the next statement, which follows this as a conclusion, shows that it was not civil power that was given to him. Let us read the entire passage: “All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” *Matthew 28:18-20*.*AMS December 1887, page 90.5*

Note the following points: 1. These words were spoken, not to civil rulers, but to private individuals whose sole office was that of “ambassadors for Christ,” to beg (not force) men to be reconciled to God. *2 Corinthians 5:20*. 2. The statement made by Christ, namely,

that all power was given unto him in Heaven and in earth, was for the sole purpose of encouraging the apostles in their work of teaching the people the truths which Christ had taught them. Said he, "All power is given unto me,"—"Go ye *therefore*, and *teach*." The power to which he referred was his power as "Mediator between God and men." It is not all civil power, but all spiritual power.*AMS December 1887, page 90.6*

Note also the following point: If our National Reform friends persist in the claim that all civil power was given to him, then they must admit that his ministers have also civil power, and that by virtue of their civil power they are to teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This is self-evident, for it is by virtue of the power that was given to Christ, that the apostles were commissioned to preach the gospel. We know that this claim has actually been made by prominent National Reform advocates. But such a claim is nothing less than a claim for the union of Church and State; indeed, it is a direct claim that the church and the State are one.*AMS December 1887, page 90.7*

(d) Christ does not receive his kingdom until just before he returns to this earth, and he receives it not from men but from the Father. See *Daniel 7:13, 14; 12:1*. The first of these passages, with the context, unmistakably refers to the last great Judgment, and it is at the close of this that Christ appears before the Father to receive "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." The latter text speaks of the standing up of Michael, who is Christ. Now the standing up of a king is an expression used in Scripture to indicate the taking of the reins of government. See *Daniel 11:2*. But the prophet says that when Michael shall stand up, that is, take his kingdom, there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time, and at that time every one of God's people shall be delivered. This time is yet in the future.*AMS December 1887, page 90.8*

(e) The Father himself says to the Son, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." *Psalms 2:8*. And the next verse states that when he thus becomes the ruler of nations he shall "break

them with a rod of iron,” and “dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.” This dashing and breaking of the nations will constitute the time of trouble such as never was.*AMS December 1887, page 90.9*

(f) In harmony with the texts quoted above, we read that under the sounding of the seventh trumpet, during which time the nations become angry, the dead are judged, the reward is given to the saints, and the wrath of God is manifested in the destruction of them which corrupt the earth, great voices are heard in Heaven saying, “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever.” *Revelation 11:15-18*. In *Revelation 19:11-21* we have a prophetic description of the smiting of the nations and the ruling of them with a rod of iron, with the statement that then Christ bears the title, “King of kings, and Lord of lords.” And Christ himself (*Matthew 25:31-46*) states that when the final separation between the righteous and the wicked shall take place, when the wicked shall be sent into everlasting punishment and the righteous shall be called to eternal life, it is when he shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, and that *then* “he will sit upon the throne of his glory.”*AMS December 1887, page 90.10*

All these texts, which constitute but a small part of the argument, show most conclusively that Christ is not now ruler of nations until he receives the kingdom from his Father just before his second coming, in power and great glory; that when he receives it he will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips, and will call the righteous to inherit his kingdom with him. Therefore, for any individual to say that Christ is now ruler of nations, is to deny the plainest declarations of Scripture; and to make the claim, as many National Reformers have done and still do, that man can have any part in giving the kingdom to Christ, is nothing less than blasphemous presumption.*AMS December 1887, page 90.11*

Next month we shall continue this examination of the National Reform Constitution. E. J. W.*AMS December 1887, page 90.12*

